



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Near East & South Asia

PAKISTAN

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980128 123

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Near East & South Asia

PAKISTAN

JPRS-NEA-92-013

CONTENTS

11 February 1992

POLITICAL

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Zaki Claims Normalization Occurring With U.S. [JASARAT 28 Dec]	1
Government Urged Not To Sacrifice Vital Interests [JANG 20 Nov]	1
Scholar Alleges U.S., Indian Blackmail [JANG 30 Nov]	2
Prospect Seen for 'Islamic World Order' [NAWA-I-WAQT 23 Dec]	3

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Editorial Views Indian Leader's Suggestion To Build Wall [NAWA-I-WAQT 3 Jan]	5
Opening of Relations With Central Asian States Viewed [JASARAT 27 Nov]	5
Agreement Reached With Azerbaijan To Exploit Oil [NAWA-I-WAQT 3 Jan]	6
Analysts Urge Nonproliferation in Region [DAWN 3, 4 Dec]	6

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Punjab: Local Elections Said 'One-Sided' [VIEWPOINT 2 Jan]	9
Punjab: Rigging, Fixing Elections Said Rampant [VIEWPOINT 9 Jan]	11
Government Said Facing 'East Pakistan' Situation [MUSAWAT 18 Dec]	12
Balochi Leader Accuses Government of Neglect [AMN 28 Dec]	13
Disillusionment With IJI Government Expressed [VIEWPOINT 9 Jan]	13
Self-Sufficiency in Nuclear Energy Near [AMN 1 Dec]	14
Commentary Emphasizes Need To Ban All Nuclear Weapons [AMN 26 Nov]	15
Editorial Calls For Better Protection of Nuclear Facilities [JANG 23 Nov]	16
Editorial Cautions Against Compromise on Nuclear Program [MUSAWAT 24 Nov]	17
Leaders Seen as 'Traditional,' Incapable of Revolution [NIDA 15 Dec]	18

ECONOMIC

Trade Unionists Call It 'Constant Battle' [VIEWPOINT 9 Jan]	21
Economic Problems Analyzed, Solutions Forecast [MUSAWAT 16 Dec]	21

MILITARY

U.S. General Meets Counterparts To Discuss Relations [MUSAWAT 20 Nov]	23
High-Level Changes in Army Reported [NAWA-I-WAQT 24 Dec]	23
Success Reported in Upgrade of F-16 [NAWA-I-WAQT 13 Dec]	24

SOCIAL

Supreme Court Dictates Civil Service To Be Apolitical [VIEWPOINT 2 Jan]	25
Educated Said Joining Criminal Gangs [JANG 23 Dec]	25
Death Threats Against Journalists Condemned [JASARAT 27 Nov]	26
Past Year Reviewed as 'Year of Scandals, Shame' [VIEWPOINT 2 Jan]	26
Article Views 'Press-Government Relations' [VIEWPOINT 2 Jan]	27

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Zaki Claims Normalization Occurring With U.S. *92AS0456D Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 28 Dec 91 p 3*

[News Report: "Government Mended Relations With U.S."]

[Text] Karachi (Staff Reporter)—Mr. Akram Zaki, secretary general of Pakistan's foreign affairs, said that "one country or a coalition of two or more countries cannot establish control over the world. Pakistan's stand on the new world order is clear. Pakistan supports a kind of organization that is in accordance with the UN mandate; one capable of establishing peace, stability, and able to resolve the basic issues that endanger peace and stability." He was addressing the Karachi Press Club's program "Meet the Press" on Friday evening. He said that "according to the UN charter, all countries have equal rights, and that we would oppose such action." Discussing the current poor relations between the United States and Pakistan, he said that Pakistan is "as important as it was in the past. Pakistan lost its importance three times in the past, also; however, the United States has to return to Pakistan repeatedly." He said that U.S.-Pakistani relations, which were severed after the 1 October 1990 suspension of economic and military aid to Pakistan, had been patched by the present government. The delegation that visited the United States under the leadership of Senate Chairman Wasim Sajjad told the United States that Pakistan is very important to the U.S.A. for resolving the Afghanistan issue, establishing peace in the Middle East, stopping drug smuggling, and establishing democracy. The delegation convinced the United States that Pakistan also wanted to stop the spread of weapons. Pakistan had different strategies, however, in this context. The United States was told that this problem would not be resolved if only one country agreed to it, and that talks at a regional level must be carried out. Pakistan was unwilling to accept any unilateral and unjust decision in any situation. The United States showed an interest in Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's suggestion about a conference between India and three other nuclear powers in this region. It is expected that the first meeting of this conference will be held in Washington. India has not expressed any reaction to this proposed conference; however, it is leaning toward it. Pakistan suggests that South Asia not only be declared free of nuclear weapons, but also of chemical, biological, and all other destructive weapons. It is expected that India and Pakistan will start talks soon to destroy chemical weapons.

He said that the government had made a definite decision soon after the victory in Khost that a political solution, rather than a military one, was necessary to resolve the Pakistan issue. After this decision, efforts were made to start talks with Iran, Saudi Arabia, the United States, and the Soviet Union. With the cooperation of Iran, conferences of the mujaheddin were called

in Islamabad and Tehran. A deputation of the mujaheddin was also sent to the United Nations and to Moscow. It was made clear to the mujaheddin that they should try to open talks with the help of the United Nations. In answer to the question about who would be responsible for transferring from Najib's government to a temporary Islamic government, he said that only time would tell what would happen. In answer to a question regarding the return of Afghan refugees, he said that plans are being made with the cooperation of international agencies. In answer to a question about the visit by Chinese leaders to India, he said, "We have no need to worry about it, since China's relationship with Pakistan is of a traditional nature." Discussing the Muslim republics in central Asia, he said that Pakistan was giving special importance to relations with central Asian republics. He added that it was "opening a new horizon that we must utilize. Pakistan will try to establish relations with central Asian republics as soon as possible, in order to counter the rapidly changing situation in this region. In addition, Pakistan is also trying to establish a common market of Islamic countries." In this context, there was also a proposal to reduce mutual taxes. There will be a conference of leaders from Iran, Turkey, and Pakistan in February. In this conference, the rapidly changing situation of the Islamic countries of the region will be discussed.

Government Urged Not To Sacrifice Vital Interests *92AS0336A JANG in Urdu 20 Nov 91 p 3*

[Editorial: "We Should Defend our Position"; quotation marks as published]

[Text] Now that U.S. undersecretary of state for international security affairs, Mr. Reginald Bartholomew, is in Islamabad to discuss the important aspects of relations with Pakistan and rounds of talks between the two countries have started, the Pakistani government should, during these talks, use as its guiding principle the basic fact that we should maintain our stand, which is based on principle and justice, on such important and fundamental issues as atomic policy, the Kashmir issue and Pak-India relations. In order to bring about a change in the U.S. attitude, we should not make the mistake of relinquishing any issue, which will later on affect our position on related matters. Undoubtedly, the removal of the coldness in Pak-U.S. relations will benefit domestic affairs and the region's peace and stability; therefore Pakistani officials should take full advantage of the possibility of any positive change. But even more important is the price at which this improvement will be achieved. It is not mere supposition but a fact that whereas the United States has tied up Pakistan in the controls of the Pressler Amendment, it has openly declared India, which is involved in dangerous atomic preparations, free from the terms of the amendment and has supplied India with \$400 million worth of the latest and most dangerous defense material, which includes the latest communication and electronic technology. On the

other hand, India and the Soviet Union have extended the period of their defense agreement. The United States has even stopped [delivery] of material for which Pakistan has already made payment and there are reports that some of the material has been sold to other countries. We are not in favor of maintaining strained relations with the United States or any other country. We have to accomplish a great deal of work to strengthen our economic structure; hence we cannot make enemies for ourselves. But we should not forget the fact that when nations compromise their principles, it takes centuries to redeem the honor they have lost. We are aware that in Pak-U.S. talks, the United States has the upper hand; but if we should succeed in convincing the United States of our importance in South Asia and the Middle East, it may become impossible for the United States to maintain its harsh and unjust attitude against us. In view of the manner in which the United States has reportedly put pressure on China to stop the supply of missiles to Pakistan and has "instructed" India, China and all other countries to refrain from helping Iran with atomic technology, prospects of improvement in Pak-U.S. relations do not appear rosy. U.S. authorities have even started accusing Pakistan of "terrorism" in occupied Kashmir and, inside Pakistan, the United States has allocated to certain politicians the job of increasing pressure on the Nawaz Sharif government in favor of U.S. interests. However, we should not forget that a country that uses illegal pressure to make us deviate from our legitimate stand can deceive us even after we change our position. In the present situation, the reasons for U.S. leanings towards India in preference to Pakistan are as clear as day. We should try in the negotiations to remove U.S. misunderstandings about Pakistan, but we should never allow ourselves to be deluded into showing the wrong kind of flexibility and weakness.

Scholar Alleges U.S., Indian Blackmail

92ASO405D Karachi JANG in Urdu 30 Nov 91 p 7

[News Report: "The Aim of U.S.-India Relations Is To Blackmail Pakistan; the U.S. Wants To Destabilize China; Pakistan Should Stand Firm on the Nuclear Program: the Advice of Intellectuals"]

[Text] Islamabad (Special Correspondent): Pakistan's prominent intellectuals and journalists repudiated the views of Selig Harrison, senior associate of the Carnegie Foundation, regarding Pakistani-U.S. relations, South Asia, the nuclear issue, Kashmir, and other matters. At the FRIENDS [Foundation for Research on National Defense and Security] seminar, Mushahid Hussain, a prominent journalist; Dr. Shirin Mazari; and Brigadier [General] Nur Hussain; commented on Selig Harrison's talk and strongly criticized his views. Addressing the seminar, Mushahid Hussain said that relations between Pakistan and China would not be affected by the visit to India of any Chinese personality because Pakistani-Chinese relations had passed through various stages and were now so strong as to be institutionalized. He said that one day prior to the visit of U.S. Under Secretary of

State Bartholomew to Pakistan, the U.S. ambassador met president Ghulam Ishaq Khan in Islamabad and assured him that M-11 missiles did not fall within the purview of the agreement relating to nuclear nonproliferation. Mushahid Hussain said that a high-level Pakistani delegation would be leaving for Beijing on 1 December to discuss important issues. He said that when India interfered in Sri Lanka in July 1987, the United States did not protest and that when the United States entered the Gulf war in 1990, India did not condemn the action. He said that the changes in the Soviet Union left Indian foreign policy in shambles; that was why India was now begging for aid from the United States. He said that the increasingly close relations between India and the United States were nothing more than blackmail aimed at Pakistan and had the purpose of airing mutual views on Islamic fundamentalism, but that Pakistanis were not worried by the new relationship between India and the United States. He said that the United States wanted to destabilize China and added that criticism of the U.S. role in the Gulf war was increasing in the United States. Dr. Shirin Mazari said that Selig Harrison's views on various issues were based on certain suppositions; that if South Asia were not important, then why was the United States concerned about tension in this area and why was the United States attaching such importance to the nuclear issue in regard to Pakistan? She said that because of Pakistan's strategic position, the country remained important in the eyes of U.S. policymakers. She said that had made a mistake in proposing a five-country conference and that Pakistan should have adopted the stance that its nuclear program was indispensable to its safety but that there should be discussion of cutbacks in conventional defense expenditures. She said that nuclear weapons had never destabilized safety whereas conventional weapons threatened safety. She added that Pakistan should resist U.S. pressure and stand firm on its nuclear option. She said that in view of the fact that the United States had always encouraged Pakistan's policy regarding Afghanistan, how could one accept the view now that Kashmir was affecting the safety of the area? She said that India had established a precedent in Bangladesh; thus, there should be no questions now about a locally born movement in Kashmir. She said that although Iraq was a signatory to the nonproliferation treaty, when Israel attacked Iraq's nuclear plant, the other members of the treaty remained silent proving that this treaty also was ineffective. Brig. Gen. Nur Hussain said that it was not correct to say that South Asia was no longer of any importance to the United States but that the United States would continue to take an interest in the affairs of the area in the future also. He said that because India had CPI and CPM [Communist Party of India and Communist Party of India-Marxist], the prospects for relations between India and the United States did not appear very bright. He said that India could not stand for long the situation in Punjab and Kashmir and would have to relinquish one of the two in the near future. He said that the new world order would not work if it did not fulfill moral requirements and the United States would have to demonstrate

its moral commitment regarding Kashmir. The chairman of the seminar, Sajjad Haider, former Pakistani ambassador to the United States, said that the war in Afghanistan had blinded the Pakistanis; that the interests of Pakistan and the United States were not the same. He said that Pakistan was given great importance when it was dependent on the United States but when it refused to remain dependent, it became unimportant in U.S. eyes. He said that Pakistan's first priority should be to improve the political situation in the country; to bring the law-and-order situation under control and ensure the supremacy of the law. He said the fact of the matter was that India wished to free itself of the Kashmir dilemma as soon as possible; that after the 1965 war, he was told by an important member of the Indian cabinet that the solution to the Kashmir issue was being discussed at the highest Indian level; that at the time, India's minister of the exchequer was sent to the United States but later Shastri died. He added that what was needed for the defense of the country was not a magic bullet but nuclear capability. He said that it was necessary for Pakistan to achieve atomic capability. At the conclusion of the seminar, General Aslam Beg, chairman of the FRIENDS, thanked the guests.

Prospect Seen for 'Islamic World Order'

92AS0452D Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 23 Dec 91
p 10

[Article by Prof. Mohammed Yaqub Shahiq: "Islamic World Order: Why and How?"]

[Text] Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan, the president of Pakistan, said while talking to Hojjat ol-Eslam Ahmad Khomeyni, son of the late Ayatollah Khomeyni, that after the defeat of communism, a situation has emerged in which Islam and capitalism are going to clash. He said that the changing situation demands that Islamic countries become active, and that they present a new "Islamic world order" to counter the new world order of the United States. The president repeated this during his talks with Fahd Sa'ud, the Saudi leader, when he visited Saudi Arabia. Both leaders announced in their joint statement that Saudi Arabia and Pakistan will oppose the new world order. The president expressed his opinion on this issue recently while laying the foundation stone of the new building for the Islamic Philosophic Council. He explained, "We believe that we cannot convince the non-Muslim world until we establish a nation according to Islamic principles. Many self-styled governments have failed, and the new tendencies that have emerged since the changes that have occurred in the world demand that we announce the development of a world that is run according to Koranic principles to counter injustice, exploitation, atrocities, instigations, and moral insolvency. Such a government would be a model for the whole world. Only in this way can the Islamic world counter the new world order by working jointly."

The president's statements are very important, and they represent the Islamic world's desires of centuries. Sayyed Jamalludin Afghani had expressed a similar desire about a united Islamic nation. He had also struggled for a long time to achieve this lofty goal. His paper, AL-URVAT-OL-VOSQA, represents his thoughts. Pakistani philosopher Iqbal also wanted to take the Islamic world out of the restriction of race and color and wanted it to be spread from "the ocean to Kashgar." He had also presented a model of an Islamic country within India, which was to act as an experimental model for the Islamic world, and which would be free of the Arabic imperialist system. The historical campaign under the leadership of Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the father of our nation, was also associated with this great goal. The fact is that the founders of Pakistan had sacrificed their lives to make the Islamic world strong and do Islam proud. They had declared Pakistan as the first cornerstone in the establishment of the great goal of Islamic nations.

Mr. Ghulam Ishaq Khan holds the highest position in our country, and his rights are greater than those of a constitutional head of a country. He has occupied many important positions from the very beginning. He has also seen the campaign for Pakistan from close quarters. He must be well aware of the inside story about this campaign and the changes that occurred after the founders of Pakistan departed and the new people took over power. This country, which came to being after the blood of hundreds of thousands of martyrs was shed, and the sacrifices of the Muslims of the Indian subcontinent has lost its goal after the death of Quaid-i Azam [Mohammed Ali Jinnah]. The way the leaders fought for power, Islamic principles were disregarded, the minds of the new generation were polluted with slogans of democracy and socialism, and the way regionalism, racism, and prejudice were encouraged are all part of a very shameful chapter of Pakistan's history.

Because of all this, Quaid-i Azam's Pakistan was divided into two parts. Still, the eyes of our leaders did not open. The country that was going to be a model for the whole world and the society, which was going to be a source of pride for all of humanity, is in fact a model of an instigatory society. The situation is so bad that our elderly leaders, who were young during the campaign for Pakistan, as well as those who had seen British India, say with great sorrow that there was a curse of slavery during that period, but there was also justice. The present society does not offer justice in any sphere, be it in getting employment, commercial dealing, or justice from courts. There is no high moral tradition. Corruption is prevalent everywhere. Criminals and thieves have made the life of innocent citizens impossible. The law enforcement agencies are protecting these lawless elements. Graft, smuggling, black marketing, stockpiling, fraud, and lies have become regular part of this society. The educational institutions and universities of this country are infested with violence, crime, and anarchy. There is no system for education. The highest leadership of this country, as well as members of law enforcement agencies, are associated with such scandals as "horse trading"

and "cooperative banks." Given the way Pakistan's society has lowered itself from a moral perspective, no one can say that it is attractive to anyone, or that it has any capability of playing the role of an Islamic form of government.

On one side, this is the depressing picture of our society's moral bankruptcy. On the other side, the superpowers are using their weapons, technology, and political influence to make the Muslims of Pakistan totally "untouchable." They cannot tolerate the economic development and nuclear capability of this country. Our neighbor, India, has never missed an opportunity to hurt Pakistan. It has been committing atrocities on the Muslims in occupied Kashmir for the last three years. Thousands of people have been martyred, and thousands of others are suffering in its torture cells. It has raped our mothers, sisters, and daughters, and it has not limited its activity to occupied Kashmir. Sindh is also a target of its instigatory activities, and it has sent its intelligence agency to start upheavals in Pakistan.

If we leave Pakistan and review other Islamic countries, then we will find that there is no development that we can be proud of. Iraq and Iran had fought a war for eight years, and the Islamic organizations failed to establish peace between the two countries. Then Iraq ignored world opinion and forcibly occupied Kuwait. It is no secret now that if Saudi Arabia had not accepted the U.S. offer, then the Iraqi military would also have entered Saudi Arabia, and the United States, openly or secretly, would have been behind it. The fact is that both Muslim countries had walked into the U.S. trap. All in all, the Islamic world is distributed into 43 small and large countries. Each of these countries suffers from colonial conspiracies. The slogans of nationalism are destroying our religious unity. Racial and communal prejudices have made the Islamic world cancerous. As a result, the idea of a "United States of Islam" is nothing more now than a dream.

In spite of all these soul-searing situations, there seems to be a light in this pitch-black night. If our country makes the unity of Islam its goal, then there is no reason for the goal for an Islamic world not to be realized. The Muslims of the whole Islamic world support the unity of our religion. The only hindrance is the leadership, which has stopped this wave with its deceptive slogans. If Pakistan's leadership firmly decides to make this its goal, then it should first discourage racial, regional, and communal slogans, and establish relations with the Islamic world powers. If this can be done, then this campaign can definitely influence the whole Islamic world. The fact is that a superpower was destroyed as a result of the Afghanistan jihad, and this has resulted in an awakening among Muslims worldwide. The Muslims of occupied Kashmir have revolted against a minisuperpower, and have demonstrated to the Islamic world a new and clear approach. The suffering masses are now awakening. In almost every part of the world, the Muslim societies are leaning toward the unity of Muslim nations. If Islamic countries once again bring the Muslim leaders to one

platform, just as they did under the OIC [Organization of Islamic Conference] banner, and at least establish a "commonwealth" of Islamic countries, then it would be a great step in this direction.

The strong reaction to the U.S. new world order has created an atmosphere that is conducive to this development. The establishment of a "commonwealth" will help intellectuals, educational experts, and scientists of the Islamic world to benefit from the experience and knowledge of each other. Centralized power will end, and racial and regional slogans will disappear. This way, the societies of Islamic countries will turn toward such a political stability where they can reorganize themselves to meet the challenges of modern needs.

The daring with which President Ghulam Ishaq Khan has raised his voice will allow him to get the support of every patriotic and sincere Muslim in Pakistan. Prime Minister Mohammed Nawaz Sharif has also expressed these sentiments in his address at the international Muslims conference. It is the high-level leadership's responsibility that they do not limit their efforts to give nice sounding and deceptive speeches. They must take steps to implement their plans that can help develop new enthusiasm in our nation. A nation can be mobilized only when clear goals are presented to it and the leadership, going through all kinds of difficulties, declares its allegiance to the goals. Only strong determination and steadfastness can help us cross this bridge. Below are some steps that must be taken in the initial period.

1. The president and the prime minister must use diplomatic efforts to call a conference of Islamic leaders. The goal of this conference should be the establishment of a "commonwealth" of Islamic nations.
2. Solid plans must be made to eliminate conflicts among Islamic countries. A strong and courageous stand must be taken in resolving the issues that are causing problems between those countries.
3. The nation must be saved from various scandals in our countries, and it must be mobilized for achieving the great goals.
4. A high-level educational and research council should be established to change the educational system in our country. This educational system must be strongly controlled by people who closely follow Islamic principles. This council should be used to recruit patriotic scholars to work for education. Solid efforts must be made to integrate the learning of science with Islamic principles.
5. Law enforcement must be established on a strong footing in the country. Effective steps must be taken to eradicate graft, corruption, and social inequities.
6. The propaganda carried out by our communications media that spreads regional nationalism, racism, and other such poisonous feelings that cause instigation and violence in our country must be fully stopped.

7. A commission composed of wise and learned scholars should be established to stop the instruction of such material that encourages factionalism in our religious schools and mosques. This commission should help establish unity in our nation.

These initial steps will definitely spread action in our nation. It will also encourage the mujaheddin in Kashmir, and the dream of a "United States of Islam" will slowly be realized, God willing.

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Editorial Views Indian Leader's Suggestion To Build Wall

92AS0452A Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 3 Jan 92
p 5

[Editorial: "Wall at India-Pakistan Border"]

[Text] Mr. Narsimha Rao, India's prime minister, has announced that India will build a barbed wire fence on its border with Pakistan in order to stop Pakistani infiltrators from entering Punjab and Kashmir. India has accused Pakistan for a long time of helping Kashmiri and Sikh freedom fighters, and of running training camps for terrorists. Pakistan has repeatedly denied this; however, India does not stop its outrageous propaganda. It has already installed barbed wire on the Pakistani border with East Punjab. This did not make any difference though. We believe that there will be no difference made by putting barbed wire on the whole border, because the freedom movement in East Punjab and occupied Kashmir are not dependent on foreign assistance. India is installing barbed wire to give the outside world the impression that these campaigns are getting assistance from Pakistan. If India fails to control the freedom campaign after sealing the whole border, then the world will understand Pakistan's assertions that it is not helping the freedom fighters. It would be appropriate for India to openly admit that occupied Kashmir and East Punjab do not want to remain in India. It would be self-delusive to install barbed wire, and it will not help in any way.

Opening of Relations With Central Asian States Viewed

92AS0405A Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 27 Nov 91 p 3

[Editorial: Pakistan and the Muslims of Central Asia]

[Text] As directed by Prime Minister Mohammad Nawaz Sharif, an 18-member high-level Pakistani delegation led by Sardar Asif Ahmad Ali, federal minister for economic affairs, left for a visit to the Russian Central Asian states. The delegation will meet with the leaders of the Muslim states as well as with Boris Yeltsin, the president of the Russian federation. The objective of the delegation is to establish commercial relations with the states and to promote mutual relations.

The collapse of communism in Russia and the changed political situation have increased the importance of these states enabling them to play a significant part in international political and economic affairs. Realizing the importance of the situation, the United States and Western Europe have already started efforts to establish relations with the Muslim states.

There are 60 million Muslims in Russia, forming the second-largest group next to the Christians. During the Tzarist and communist regimes, these Muslim states of Turkestan, which had been independent for centuries, were one by one annexed by the Russian empire. The Muslims were subjected to oppression and violence in efforts to cripple their religion and culture. But in spite of all the cruelties and hardships inflicted on them, the Muslims endeavored to keep alive their religion, culture, and traditions. Now that the communist system has ended in Russia and territories, which were occupied by force are free and striving for freedom, the wishes and aspirations of Muslim states should be taken into consideration. Muslim states have the same right to freedom as the Baltic states; but unfortunately, the world of Islam has failed to offer encouragement to Russian Muslims. Turkey is the sole Muslim country that has recognized the independence of Azerbaijan. Under these circumstances, the visit by the delegation from Pakistan to the Muslim states has great significance.

For centuries, the people of Pakistan have enjoyed religious, social, cultural, and trade relations with the Muslims of Russian Turkestan and it is necessary now to revitalize and strengthen these relations. Speaking with journalists before leaving for Moscow, the leader of the delegation Sardar Asif Ahmad Ali said that his delegation was taking concrete proposals to the Central Asian states, which he could not as yet divulge. These proposals, he said, dealt with government affairs only whereas what the people of Pakistan wanted was that Pakistan and rich Muslim states offer support to the Muslims of Turkestan; if Muslim countries showed lack of interest, the Muslims of Turkestan would turn to other nations for support and cooperation which would be a tragic outcome for the world of Islam.

By sending a delegation, the government of Pakistan has started a beneficial process; it is to be hoped that the initiation of air service to Tashkent will facilitate the exchange of business and industrial delegations between the two areas. Muslim scholars and Islamic minded political leaders should also have an opportunity to visit Turkestan because they can offer guidance in the right direction to the Muslims of that area. There is an urgent need at present for trust and unity among the states of Turkestan. In the past, Tzarist and communist rulers took advantage of the dissension and mutual unjust treatment among these states. The Muslims of the area should learn from the bitter experiences of the past and start united efforts to gain recognition for their status. The changing conditions in the world especially in Russia point to the eventual liberation of the Muslim areas of Turkestan which, because of their geographical

position and manpower, can attain a distinguished and prominent position in world politics.

Agreement Reached With Azerbaijan To Exploit Oil

92AS0452B Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 3 Jan 92
pp 1, 11

[News Report: "Agreement With Azerbaijan To Exploit Oil"]

[Text] Karachi (Monitoring Desk)—A new agreement was signed between Pakistan and Azerbaijan on Thursday for offshore oil drilling. A joint company was established under the Pakistani Government's new policy of giving special assistance to foreign investors. According to this agreement, the Azerbaijan association will provide 40 percent, and a Pakistani corporation will provide 60 percent of the capital for this undertaking. The director general of the Azerbaijan association told Pakistani television in an interview that his country wants to establish strong economic and trade relations with Pakistan. He said that both countries have strong religious and cultural ties.

Analysts Urge Nonproliferation in Region

92WP0109A Karachi DAWN in English 3, 4 Dec 91

[Articles by Munir Ahmad Khan, former chairman of Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission]

[3 Dec 91 p 12]

[Text] There is a growing realisation by the international community that there should be an early reduction in, and ultimate elimination of, all types of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons to ensure survival of mankind. With the end of the cold war, the prospects for concrete agreements towards meaningful disarmament have improved.

The signing of the landmark START Treaty and unilateral offers of reduction in the deployment of tactical and other nuclear weapons constitute a significant step forward. Although these measures will still leave both USA and USSR with enormous nuclear stockpiles for overkill they represent a new thinking and could generate greater momentum towards achievement of arms control. This change in the international climate could hopefully pave the way for the initiation of constructive dialogues at the regional level among various nuclear contenders.

Western defence analysts believe that nuclear weapons are unusable at the global level and extremely difficult to employ in regional conflicts because of their possible triggering effect leading to worldwide conflagration. The prestige and power associated with nuclear weapons in the 1960's have faded because they are no longer considered to be effective in ensuring ultimate security or winning a decisive victory.

South Asia is a crucial region with respect to nuclear proliferation. Even though it is backward economically and technologically, yet due to combination of concerted efforts and political will, it has made considerable advances in nuclear technology. India carried out an underground nuclear explosion in 1974 and Pakistan is alleged to have acquired nuclear capability.

Some outside observers fear that given the adversarial relationship between India and Pakistan, a nuclear arms race could develop between the two with serious consequences for regional and global security. The two countries already spend a high percentage of their respective national budgets on defence. Added pursuit of nuclear weapons could further strain their economies causing internal difficulties and social and political unrest.

While these arguments against acquisition of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan appeal to the outside observers they are not shared by their respective policy makers and public at the present time.

India, because of its past history, large population, and geographical location, aspires not only to be a regional but a global power. It reckons that in order to make this power credible, the acquisition of nuclear weapons and associated delivery systems is necessary to project it beyond its frontiers. It also wants a seat on the Security Council. There are many Indians who believe that India must match the nuclear and military capability of China to offset Chinese influence in the region and the World.

India has repeatedly asserted that in spite of the underground nuclear explosion carried out in 1974, India's nuclear programme is peaceful and it has not carried out any further nuclear tests. However, it objects to the signing of NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty] which it regards as discriminatory. It is willing to forego the nuclear option only as part of a worldwide nuclear disarmament regime which would also cover the two superpowers. It also alleges that Pakistan's nuclear programme poses a threat which compels it to continue on the nuclear path.

Pakistan's Perceptions: As seen by Pakistan, India aims at establishing its hegemony over the entire South Asian region and an atomic arsenal could give it the power to carry out nuclear blackmail. Pakistan being only one-eighteenth of the size of India feels very insecure and is forced to maintain a sizeable army though much smaller than that of its much larger neighbour. Nuclear capability is seen as the ultimate deterrent against any Indian aggression and a guarantee of security. Pakistan, therefore, is unwilling to give up the nuclear option as long as India does not do the same.

India was one of the first developing countries to initiate a long-range atomic energy programme with the establishment of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission in 1948. At the opening of its first reactor in 1956, Indian PM [Prime Minister] Nehru said "We shall never use this atomic energy for evil purposes." However, the situation began to change soon after India started

building the Canadian-supplied 40 MW [megawatts] plutonium production reactor. Soon after its completion, Dr Bhaba stated that "in two years India could produce nuclear weapons."

In 1963 just before the completion of a reprocessing plant adjacent to the Canada-India reactor, Nehru said: "nuclear weapons are an expensive proposition and would be a drain on our resources. Nevertheless, we would do anything possible to meet the nuclear threat."

At that time it was difficult to identify any nuclear threat to India from the region or elsewhere.

It appears that the development of nuclear weapons has been very much in the minds of the Indian leaders long before China exploded a nuclear device in 1964. India started definitive plans to stage an underground nuclear explosion in mid-1960s. In fact in September 1971 during the 4th Geneva Conference Dr Sarabhai, the Chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission publicly announced India's interest in carrying out an underground nuclear explosion which was later confirmed by Mrs Indira Gandhi. This was a clear signal to the world that India was on the way to explode a nuclear device as a first step towards acquisition of nuclear weapons.

These policy statements were matched by a rapid expansion of India's unsafeguarded programme. Today, India possesses a large number of unsafeguarded nuclear facilities including 2 plutonium production reactors, 3 reprocessing plants, and facilities for production of tritium, lithium, and beryllium which are the essential ingredients for sophisticated nuclear weapons.

It is estimated that at the end of 1990, India had an unsafeguarded plutonium inventory of about 1,200 kg, out of which weapons grade plutonium was about 600 kg, increasing at the rate of 45 kg per year. In addition, India has built an ultracentrifuge enrichment facility consisting of several thousands centrifuges near Bangalore which could produce highly enriched uranium. From purely technical point of view, it appears that besides having stockpiled enough weapon-grade plutonium for over 100 devices, India already possesses the capability to produce at least 20 more devices per year. This does not take into account the potential weapons use of very considerable unsafeguarded reactor grade plutonium which India is accumulating from its several power reactors. It is thus possible that by end-1990s, India could have nuclear material for manufacturing over 300 nuclear weapons.

India has been going ahead with a parallel development of a viable delivery system. It already tested the intermediate-range ballistic missile AGNI with a range of 2500 km. Its range can be doubled and accuracy improved. In addition, India is also known to have a strong interest in building its own nuclear submarines. Through loaning a nuclear submarine from USSR it has

acquired technical knowhow for designing its own submarines in the future. India thus has a very comprehensive and well-planned nuclear programme backed by an aggressive delivery system. By mid-90s India could pose a credible nuclear threat within the region and beyond.

Pakistan was a late starter in the nuclear field and its nuclear programme is much smaller and limited as compared to that of India. The Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) was established in 1958.

Pakistan's nuclear programme received importance after 1972 when it was put directly under the Prime Minister. During the same year, the 125 MW Candu power reactor at Karachi was commissioned. However, the 1974 nuclear explosion by India had a very adverse effect on Pakistan's nuclear programme. It led to the imposition of restrictions and embargoes on the supply of nuclear knowhow, materials and facilities to Pakistan.

A number of contracts which Pakistan has signed with the supplier states were unilaterally cancelled or not honoured. These included those relating to supply of a small heavy water plant with Germany, a fuel fabrication plant with Canada and a reprocessing plant with France.

In addition, Canada imposed a strict embargo on the supply of all spare parts, fuel materials and technical services for operation of KANUPP [Karachi Nuclear Power Project] which was and remains under safeguards of IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency]. All this created serious difficulties for Pakistan and slowed down its programme.

[4 Dec 91 pp 11, 16]

[Text] In 1976, to meet its power shortages, Pakistan embarked upon a plan for building light water reactors, nuclear power plants which require slightly enriched uranium. It proceeded with R&D work on uranium enrichment in 1976 and took several years to build a small facility which is in operation at Kahuta. Based on the experience with this facility, it might be possible in the future to produce enough enriched uranium to meet the needs of a light water reactor.

Pakistan has also acquired basic capability in several other areas of nuclear fuel cycle. It produces its own uranium, fabricates natural uranium fuel, has constructed facilities for research and development in various fields at PINSTECH [Pakistan Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology] where it is now completing a 10 MW [megawatts] research reactor to replace the 25-year-old MW swimming pool reactor. The new reactor will be under IAEA safeguards.

It is quite clear that Pakistan's nuclear programme is much smaller as compared to that of India. Its only power reactor and the two research reactors are all under Agency's safeguards. The facilities outside safeguards include R&D enrichment facility at Kahuta, a small fuel fabrication plant at Chasnupp fed by a uranium fuel production facility at D.G. Khan.

Pakistan has not acquired a nuclear delivery system. In any case Pakistan does not possess a nuclear weapon or device which can be fitted into a supersonic aircraft or missile.

Pakistan has been concerned about India's growing nuclear capability for a considerable time. In 1964 when India completed a reprocessing plant, it openly asserted that it could explode a nuclear device in a relatively short time. Pakistan conveyed its fears to both Canada and the United States but both played down the prospects of India going nuclear. In fact, Dr Seaborg, the Chairman of US Atomic Energy Commission during his visit to Pakistan in mid-60s told the Pakistani authorities that India did not have the capability and knowhow to go nuclear. But this could not allay Pakistan's genuine fears.

When the discussions started on the draft of NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty], Pakistan proposed that firm guarantees should be given to the non-nuclear weapon states against any nuclear attack or blackmail. However, the sponsors of NPT refused to agree to any such provisions. In September 1971 when India openly announced its interest in carrying out an underground nuclear explosion, very little notice was taken of these plans. At the insistence of a few countries including Pakistan, Prime Minister Trudeau approached India but failed to get any assurances that plutonium from Canada-India reactor would not be used for staging a nuclear explosion.

In contrast with India's growing interest in nuclear weapons Pakistan decided to make its position very clear. At the inauguration of KANUPP [Karachi Nuclear Power Project] in November 1972, the then Prime Minister of Pakistan made a declaration of Pakistan's nuclear policy in the following words:

"Pakistan believes in using atomic energy for peaceful purposes and as an instrument for development and progress.... The most menacing problem in the sub-continent is that of poverty and misery of its peoples. Atomic energy should become a symbol of hope rather than of fear. For this reason, we would welcome if this entire sub-continent by the agreement of the countries concerned could be declared to be a nuclear-free zone and the introduction of nuclear weapons banned the same way as the Latin American countries have done."

India instead of responding positively to this peaceful overture went ahead with an underground nuclear explosion in May 1974. Surprisingly, the nuclear weapons states themselves did not express any strong indignation officially but their Press was more critical. Later, the advanced countries decided to impose embargoes and restrictions on the supply of nuclear technology, materials and equipment to non-nuclear states not signatory to the NPT.

The overall effect was a set-back to development of peaceful nuclear energy programmes throughout the world. Pakistan was most seriously affected. In the first instance, India's underground nuclear explosion had

maximum political impact on the public opinion in Pakistan and heightened fears of India's nuclear hegemony over the region. Secondly, while the supplier states were slow in cutting off cooperation with India, Pakistan suffered most in terms of denial of supplies of nuclear equipment and technology. Almost all its international supply contracts which were under safeguards were cancelled causing financial loss and serious delays in implementing Pakistan's nuclear programme.

It has been alleged that Pakistan's programme of enrichment of uranium and construction of various other facilities are meant to build nuclear weapons and Pakistan has already either made a nuclear device or has the capability of doing so in a short time. These allegations have been repeatedly refuted by the Government of Pakistan which has reaffirmed again and again that its nuclear programme is peaceful and it has no intention of making nuclear weapons.

Until October 1989, the President of USA continued to certify that Pakistan did not possess a nuclear device. However, in September 1990, he did not issue such certification as required under the Pressler Amendment and consequently all US military and economic assistance to Pakistan was cut off. Pakistan's stand is that nothing has happened or changed between October 1989 and September 1990 to invoke Pressler Amendment. Incidentally, USA has not charged that Pakistan does actually possess a nuclear device. It is a matter of how the Pressler Amendment is interpreted legally and politically by USA. The fact that USA and Pakistan are continuing intensive discussion on the matter indicates a desire to resolve this dispute amicably and restore normal cooperation between the two countries.

Pakistan is a developing country with very limited scientific, technological and economic resources. It can neither pursue nor afford the acquisition of nuclear weaponry and its delivery system which will be too expensive. This is why successive governments in Pakistan have pursued a policy of making South Asia free of all nuclear weapons. Since 1974 it has been advocating the establishment of NFZ [Nuclear-Free Zone] in South Asia which has been repeatedly endorsed by an overwhelming majority in the UN General Assembly.

India has so far refused to respond positively to the various UN resolutions on this matter. Pakistan has also continued to press India bilaterally on the nuclear issue. Several letters between the heads of two governments have been exchanged and a number of discussions held at different levels. These contacts are still continuing but without any apparent breakthrough so far.

Over the years Pakistan has made several specific proposals to India to strengthen non-proliferation regime in South Asia. These include: simultaneous accession by India and Pakistan to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; acceptance of full-scope safeguards; mutual inspection of each other's nuclear facilities; joint declaration, renouncing the acquisition or development of

nuclear weapons; establishment of a nuclear weapon free zone in South Asia; convening of a conference of nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia under UN auspices; and a bilateral treaty to ban all nuclear tests.

These proposals offer a wide range of possibilities to India to take some meaningful steps towards denuclearisation of South Asia and preventing a nuclear arms race in the sub-continent. In spite of the flexibility shown by Pakistan, India has not yet responded affirmatively to any of the above proposals.

Pakistan is willing to consider any alternative proposal by India which would serve to establish a non-discriminatory non-proliferation regime in South Asia to be applied equally to both India and Pakistan. It would be both unrealistic and unfair to expect Pakistan to agree to any specific non-proliferation measures unilaterally as it would leave India free to pursue nuclear option and thereby defeat the very purpose of achieving non-proliferation in the area.

In December 1985, both sides agreed to take a small step towards lowering nuclear tensions in the region by agreeing not to attack each other's nuclear facilities. It took 3 years to negotiate the text of the agreement which was signed in December 1988 and formally ratified at the end of January 1991. Under this agreement both sides must exchange a list of all nuclear facilities not later than January 1st, 1992 which they are expected to do so.

Meanwhile, Pakistan has continued to press for greater international support for strengthening the non-proliferation regime in South Asia. India has been objecting to the establishment of an NFZ in South Asia by arguing that such an NFZ could not go ahead without global nuclear disarmament and involving China.

Consequently, the Pakistan Government approached the United States, Soviet Union and China to take part in a meeting to discuss the establishment of a nuclear free zone in South Asia. After obtaining their consent, the Prime Minister of Pakistan has proposed a five-power meeting consisting of representatives of USA, USSR, China, India and Pakistan to discuss this matter. India's initial reaction has been negative.

However, it is hoped that India might show a measure of flexibility on this issue. In fact, the holding of such a five-power meeting could provide an excellent opportunity to enter into a meaningful discussion on non-proliferation issue in this region and constitute a significant step in the right direction.

In August 1991, China announced its decision, in principle, to sign the NPT. This is a major development and may serve to neutralise many of the objections of India to the establishment of NFZ in South Asia by practically removing the so-called China factor. The initial comment by India on this announcement does not indicate any change in India's nuclear stance.

This seems to show that basically India's nuclear policy will not be determined by Chinese decision to sign the NPT or Pakistan's willingness to do so simultaneously with India but on other considerations and perceptions. It gives the indication that India wants to become a nuclear weapon state anyhow, assert its position as a global power and claim a seat in the Security Council to play a wider political and security role. If these are indeed, the real objectives of India's policy then there will be grave problems in achieving non-proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere, too.

There is no doubt that non-proliferation in South Asia is a very serious problem and any lasting solution must address the genuine concerns of all the countries of this region.

In the present global climate, India cannot continue to say 'no' to all the non-proliferation proposals and initiatives and defy the international community which is pressing India for a response. In the interest of welfare of the people of this region, a dialogue between India and Pakistan on the nuclear issue must begin soon before the tempo of the nuclear race in South Asia quickens and more resources are committed to the pursuit of the nuclear option which could be destabilising not only for the region but for the world also.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Punjab: Local Elections Said 'One-Sided'

92AS0459E Lahore VIEWPOINT in English 2 Jan 92
pp 17-18

[Article by Zafaryab Ahmed: "Winning on Mr. Wyne's Slow Wicket"]

[Text] The local elections, held in the Punjab last week, were a one-sided affair. Given the commercialisation of the electoral process along with rigging, it couldn't have been otherwise. Despite the triangular contests in almost all the constituencies and parties in the IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] arrayed against each other, the Muslim League candidates defeated their rivals with margins unheard of in local elections. In certain constituencies of Lahore, the difference between the winning and the losing candidates was more than half of the total votes polled. The PML [Pakistan Muslim League] as the ruling party had the resources available to it to transport voters to the polling stations. This was a major factor.

Generally, the elections did not generate any great public enthusiasm and this was reflected in the low to extremely low turnout. This suited the PML and other IJI parties rather than the PDA/PPP [People's Democratic Alliance/Pakistan People's Party] and was indicative of the general loss of faith of the people in the electoral process. A large number of voters preferred to stay at home on a chilly winter's day.

A VIEWPOINT survey shows that just an hour before the close, less than one-fourth of the votes had been cast.

Irregularities

Almost every candidate other than the official ones had complaints about electoral irregularities like parts of the voters' lists not being supplied to them, last-minute changes in the election scheme; supply of fresh voting lists on election morning. At some polling stations, there were complaints about deletion of legitimate voters. Bogus voting, mainly in female polling booths with the connivance of the local administration, was also alleged. Representatives of certain candidates claimed that their complaints were rejected out of hand by the presiding officers. There were voters who went to the polling stations only to find that their votes had already been cast.

There were also complaints that the election staff instead of being supplied with electoral material on Friday, was asked to collect it on election morning. The entire planning of the elections is symptomatic of the haste with the whole exercise was undertaken. It seems to have been planned without any consideration for the ethnic and religious composition of the electorate. It betrayed lack of consideration especially for the Christians who didn't like it because it fell during Christmas week. December 25 and 26 were closed holidays, followed a day later by Friday. These holidays made it extremely difficult for Christian candidates to canvass support.

Polling at quite a few stations in Lahore didn't start on time. At various polling stations, the designated staff failed to turn up. In a Lahore ward, elections didn't start till late in the afternoon. To cover these and other irregularities, the Punjab Government suspended the Assistant Commissioner, Lahore Cantt. on charges of dereliction of duty. The PDA circles look at the suspension as a punishment for the victory of their candidates in wards under his control. Then a lot is being ascribed to the delay in the announcement of results. The results of many wards were not announced till after midnight. A candidate in Gujranwala who was declared successful on the first count, was declared defeated on a recount.

Despite the elaborate arrangements to maintain law and order, incidents of violence were reported from various parts of the province in which at least 14 persons were killed and scores of others were injured. Hundreds of supporters of different candidates were arrested. However, police, backed by other law-enforcing agencies generally kept the situation under control. The Inspector-General of Police, Punjab, took solace in the fact that the number of those killed this year was lower than that during the last elections.

Apart from the Muslim League, the other party which ran an organised campaign with the help of its youth and student wings and fared relatively better was the Jamaat-i-Islami. As the Jamaat is predominantly an urban-based party, in Lahore it managed to win in most of the wards

that fell within the constituencies where the Jamaat candidates had won the provincial and National Assembly seats.

The elections were generally contested on the basis of biradari and kinship. In the major cities, however, it was not just the biradari factor which decided the outcome. In some constituencies two candidates from the same biradari were pitched against each other. "There are all sorts of Butts (a Kashmiri subcaste)," said a wizened old citizen when asked why he was opposed to the official candidate who belonged to his biradari. "There are Kashmiris voting for him but not all. The majority is with him because it expects this or that favour from him." The Kashmiris won most seats in Lahore.

"I had to vote for the official candidate because he promised to get the road in front of my house repaired. I have no regrets for not having voted for the candidate from my own party," said a PPP supporter in a Lahore ward. Another voter in another ward where the PPP candidate had won in the previous elections, said: "I didn't go out to vote. I didn't feel like it. What is the use? Last year, our candidate won but no development work was taken in hand as no funds were released. In the ward adjacent to ours, the PML candidate spent three times more than what he was entitled to spend in four years."

A voter from Beadon Road where a cousin of the PM [prime minister] was contesting, said: "The PML is lucky because the anti-PPP voters have no choice but to vote for its candidates. I voted for the Jamaat candidate. Had he not been there, I would have either abstained or voted for the PML candidate whom I don't like." Another voter in the same ward, pointing towards a poster eliciting support for a young and educated candidate, said: "I personally know that he failed in his matriculation examination. What can one expect from a person whose campaign is full of lies? Not only this. Some of the candidates in certain other wards whom I personally know are the worst kind of rascals and swindlers but are presenting themselves as paragons of virtue."

The Poor

In another ward with an adjoining katchi abadi, a defeated candidate said: "You can't trust the poor any longer. They have become crooks. They promised to vote for me but sold their votes for Rs.[rupees]2,000 each. The money was given to them out of development funds. I don't think there was a genuine contest or that our opponents won fairly and squarely."

In the rural constituencies, biradari and factional alignments did play a crucial role in the final outcome. In Multan, it turned out to be a contest between the Gilanis and the Qureshis with the former dominating.

There are claims and counter-claims. The Prime Minister and his brother who showed a personal interest in the elections have termed the outcome as "the reaffirmation of the mandate the people gave to the IJI in the general elections." The PDA, on the other hand, sees it as

a continuation of the politics of manipulation and has accused the Government of "stealing another election." The Punjab Government has appointed 356 tribunals to decide election disputes. The Opposition has charged that this is a bid to legitimise the rigging which took place.

Amidst all these claims and counter-claims (the IJI/PML says it has won 70 percent of the seats while Ms. Bhutto says the PPP/PDA secured 40 percent of them), even a cursory look at the election reports justifies the views of a defeated candidate: "I accept my defeat but it wouldn't have been so had a Muslim League Government not been in power."

The Muslim League had been planning to win the election from the day it formed the provincial Government. Even if it didn't make any conscious effort to achieve this objective, it has a hierarchical structure of power relations to bestow patronage and manipulate the various factions which are in power at the local level. The Chief Minister was directly involved and issued statements in favour of the Muslim League's 'humkhyal' or like-minded candidates. The Governor has a personal interest in city politics. His biradari wants an Arain mayor for the city. Most of the PML candidates were sitting councillors with access to all the development resources. The Ministers, the MNAs, the MPAs and, above all, the administration, were on their side.

In contrast, the Opposition candidates not only lacked resources but there was also no pyramid of leadership to organise the campaign. Almost all its candidates fought lone battles. In many wards, the candidates, particularly those whom the PDA had awarded tickets in the general elections, complained of the lukewarm attitude of their leadership. There was no towering personality to balance the Chief Minister, the Governor or for that matter the mayors. The PDA leaders did address some rallies but it was neither here nor there.

It will be wrong to assume that the shackles of non-party politics at local-level can't be broken or can be broken only if the countervailing forces can mobilise same kind of resources to defeat the political entrepreneurs now in power. In fact, the Opposition failed to politicise the campaign. The low turnout is one major indicator of its failure to mobilise the electorate and the local politics match was played on a slow wicket which Mr. Wyne had prepared. Though its candidates accuse the PDA leadership for not coming out to meet the IJI challenge, the flaw is inherent in the very structure of the opposition. An old People's Party worker, remembering Mr. Bhutto in the 70s, lamented: "Bhutto didn't win out of nothing. I remember he addressed rallies at all the main crossings in Lahore in one single day. The Punjabis don't like an impersonal leadership. They went along with Mr. Bhutto in 1970 because he came to them."

Punjab: Rigging, Fixing Elections Said Rampant
92AS0460B Lahore *VIEWPOINT* in English
9 Jan 92 p 10

[Text] Anyone who has visited the Punjab Election Authority's offices during the past 10 days knows how ham-handedly the local bodies election in the province was rigged. Thousands of petitioners have challenged the results announced by returning officers and the grounds taken in a number of cases suggest that local body election has become a selection by presiding and executive officers. So great was the rush of petitioners last Thursday that the presiding judge granted all the 300 and odd applicants stay against declaration of results if these had not been notified already. (This forced many privileged candidates to secure back-dated notifications).

It may be recalled that when the controversy over alleged rigging in the 1990 general election broke, the Chief Election Commissioner argued that the small number of election petitions proved the elections had been fair. Well, if the number of petitions alleging gross irregularities in an election is a correct indication of the polls being unfair, there is plenty of evidence on record at the Punjab Election Authority.

Take this case from Karor Pucca. A candidate won by one vote and went out into the streets to celebrate. His more influential rival went to a women's polling station, coerced the presiding officer to cancel one of the winner's vote and to restore two of his cancelled ones. The one who had lost won by two votes.

Or the case of the petitioner who had polled 338 votes at a polling station and had all but a few cancelled by the presiding officer.

Then there was a candidate from Gujrat who alleged that more ballot papers had been counted at a polling station than the number of votes in the list. The presiding officer had recommended that the poll be countermanded but the Assistant Commissioner had rejected this plea and announced the result.

One glaring flaw in the election scheme pointed out by a number of candidates is the changes in the ballot paper introduced this time. The ballot papers for last month's polls carried only the symbols allotted to the candidates. They bore neither the names of the candidates nor the names of wards or polling stations. A ballot paper issued at one place could thus be cast at another and nobody could check the mischief unless the ballot papers were scrutinized at a recount.

Obviously, executive authorities throughout the province, especially in the rural areas, are enjoying their licence to "elect" public representatives regardless of voter preferences.

Finally, the last nail in the theory of non-party polls has been driven by the disclosure that the Prime Minister, as the head of IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance], will nominate the heads of local bodies.

Government Said Facing 'East Pakistan' Situation
92AS0456B Lahore MUSAWAT in Urdu 18 Dec 91 p 3

[Editorial: "Stop Creating Situation Like East Punjab"]

[Text] Benazir Bhutto, leader of the opposition party and cochairperson of the PPP [Pakistan People's Party], said that the government is repeating the history of 1971. She said the situation in Sindh is analogous to East Pakistan, and "it must be alleviated immediately, or history will never forgive us." The fact is that nations that do not learn from their history are soon used by history as a lesson to others. At present, our society is suffering from a lack of self-respect and pride. Our leaders came to power promising the implementation of an Islamic form of government. The law-and-order situation in our country is deplorable. The people are worried about yet another martial law regime because of their feelings of insecurity. When a situation reaches such an extreme, then the danger of external interference increases, because a country suffering from internal strife can fall prey to a little effort from the enemy. Mr. S.B. Chavan, India's home minister, has accused Pakistan of helping the separatist groups of East Punjab and occupied Kashmir. He has threatened that India will take military action for interfering on its borders, because India cannot tolerate interference in its internal affairs. While accusing Pakistan of helping the guerilla groups and sending terrorists across the borders, he said that Pakistan was conspiring to destroy India. According to him, Pakistan has encouraged the Sikh campaign, and is starting problems in occupied Kashmir. They are also carrying out anti-Pakistan propaganda at international level, demanding that Pakistan be declared a terrorist nation. Mr. Robert Gates, the CIA director, also expressed the danger of an Indian-Pakistani nuclear war recently. The United States and India are also starting defense cooperation under the new world order. There are plans to put military pressure on Pakistan. The United States has also offered to supply India with ultramodern radar equipment and "automatic cannons." Therefore, in this changing geopolitical and military situation, India's threat is understandable. It is important to mention here that the United States has also offered India the supply of force multipliers that are capable of launching bombs or missiles with 100-percent accuracy. India has also warned China, and has told it to stop supplying nuclear technology and traditional army assistance. It is alleged that the Chinese weapons supplied to Pakistan are being sent to the separatist elements of Assam via Burma. India never misses an opportunity to accuse Pakistan. The irony is that the international human rights organizations are ignoring the bestial acts and atrocities being committed by Indian soldiers in Kashmir. India also blasted an nuclear bomb in Rajasthan. Indian officials insisted that this blast was to destroy elements of pollution. According to The TIMES OF INDIA, the United States has appointed India the policeman of this region. All this may be true; however, our existence depends on our cooperation and national unity. We have not done a thing in this area. Our

atmosphere is poisoned because of mutual rivalries and strife. We have not done anything to remove conflicts between various groups. Nothing has been done to unite our nation. Not just our rural and urban areas, but our alleys and small settlements are also suffering from this strife. Our political atmosphere is very intolerant. This is the reason that India has threatened to attack us and has accused Pakistan of helping the separatist elements in occupied Kashmir and East Punjab. India wants to demonstrate its policeman status to Pakistan now. Pakistan has always tried to be friendly with India, and has invited it to resolve all conflicts, including the Kashmir issue, by talks. The Indian leaders, however, have never agreed to such cooperative talks with Pakistan. Instead, whenever they find the opportunity, they hurt Pakistan's unity. There are many lessons hidden in East Pakistan. If we consider [the loss of East Pakistan] the act of the Indian armed forces, we also have to think it the result of our attitude. If the people of East Pakistan did not have this feeling of deprivation, we would not have lost a large portion of our country. Because of intolerant politics, realistic attitudes have disappeared. Instead of showing overzealousness, we must practice understanding, patience, and understanding. What the IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] government has done during the last year is limited to spreading prejudice, levying accusations, and taking revenge. Our politicians have not convinced the people, because the people still have all the problems they had before. The government has not succeeded in developing an understanding with the opposition. One positive aspect of our complicated political situation is that the feeling for understanding is emerging. We are not seeing any practical results of this, however; it appears that the president and the prime minister do not want to change their stand. The situation has reached a point where only President Ghulam Ishaq Khan can alleviate it, because the present crisis seems to be surrounding his person. Government offices are often willing to start talks with the opposition. For some reason, however, no effective step was taken. That is why this political crisis is still continuing. Mentions of talks and negotiations are made with such apathy that no formal invitation to talks has been made. Perhaps the main reason for this is that the government does not give much importance to the opposition and does not realize how much power it has. Such methods are dangerous in a democratic society. It appears that our prime minister does not believe in the politics of cooperation. He challenges the opposition whenever he finds an excuse to do so. Perhaps we have not learned any lessons from history. The government is not willing to give appropriate importance to the opposition. Just as in the past, all political opponents are declared enemies of the country. The system of political revenges in the name of investigations continues. Our politicians do not have time to think about how politics of cooperation can help us make progress. The secret of a successful democratic government is open negotiations and understanding between the opposition and the government. Problems cannot be solved by confrontation. The interests of Pakistan demand understanding and cooperation. There

is nothing but destruction in the politics of confrontation. Our leaders are wasting their intellectual energies against each other. It is the responsibility of our government to start talking with the opposition. If it is serious, it should try to bring all issues to the table to resolve them. Only Pakistan's enemies will benefit from these confrontations. All developmental work has been suspended. The economic and social problems of our country need resolution. Everyone has the right to express an opinion in a democratic government; however, such an opposition must be treated as an enemy. Both the government and the opposition have the duty to work for Pakistan's progress, existence, and welfare. The government and the opposition should always respect and recognize each other's importance. These are democratic practices. Pakistan's interests are in the elimination of situations like that of East Pakistan. The opposition leader, Mrs. Benazir Bhutto, is correct in saying that our government is repeating the history of 1971. We must learn our lesson from history.

Balochi Leader Accuses Government of Neglect

92AS0456C Karachi AMN in Urdu 28 Dec 91 p 3

[News Report: "Policy of Neglecting Balochs Must End"]

[Text] Karachi, 27 December (Staff Reporter)—Anwar Bhai Jan, leader of the Baloch union movement, said that if the government does not take serious steps to resolve the problem facing Baloch communities and people, and continues to deprive them of their rights, then the Baloch Union would not remain quiet. He said that it would start action soon, and emerge in front of the people, adding that they would hold a peaceful demonstration against the government's extreme actions. He was addressing a public meeting at the central secretariat of the Baloch Union. Mr. Anwar Bhai Jan said that not only were there no developmental projects in Liari and other Baloch areas, but that those areas lack even basic amenities. People beg even for drinking water. He said that the development projects started by the former government in the Liari area have been left unfinished. There is no development program in Baloch areas. Mr. Hanif Baloch said that if the government continued to ignore the Balochis in the health, education, and employment areas, they would act "like a strong wall against the government." Mr. Ghulam Nabi Baloch, leader of the Pakistan Steel unit of the Baloch Union labor organization, as well as some other leaders, addressed this meeting. According to resolutions passed at this public meeting, the government was asked not to ignore Balochis in the area of employment. They should be provided with employment in federal and state governments under an established program. They asked that [illegible word] be ended and that a new system be started in Liari.

Disillusionment With IJI Government Expressed

92AS0460A Lahore VIEWPOINT in English
9 Jan 92 pp 7-8

[Text] In many ways Pakistan remains under close siege, with no credible evidence to show that the IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] government possess either the capacity or the will to find solutions to the country's worsening crises.

The domestic political scene remains murky, with the ruling party and the Opposition at loggerheads, their exchanges dominated by sour polemics and stale platitudes. Primary responsibility for the situation remains with the Government, because, despite occasional talk of respect for democratic norms, its pattern of rule conforms more to the legacy of the dictatorship which inspired—and conspired to create—the IJI. Apart from crude suppression of civil liberties and Press freedom, Government policies make it difficult for Opposition parties to function freely, particularly in Sindh. Then, promises of economic revival and renovation on the basis of privatization and denationalization have been marred by scandals that continue to spread. With the Cooperatives scam still unexplored, reports about the BCCI [Bank of Credit and Commerce International] show that Pakistani businessmen are involved in many fraudulent deals sponsored by an institution now generally referred to as the bank of crooks and criminals. Then, while concessions continue to be given to influential lobbies in agriculture, industry, and trade, there is no guarantee that this will help Pakistan begin to end a stagflation that is causing widespread distress among large sections of the people.

Uneasy Borders

Even more serious is the situation on our borders resulting from Government's dubious policies. On the west, if the Geneva Accord had been fully implemented, by now the UN plan could have brought peace to Afghanistan and ensured the return of millions of refugees who, because of the cut-off of funds from many donors, are becoming an increasing burden for Pakistan. Even today, there is no early possibility of peace, because the Pakistan Government seems to lack the courage to take the right decisions. Apparently, vested interests among the Afghan rebels and other agencies, indigenous or foreign, want the war in Afghanistan to continue until a government chosen by these select groups has been installed in Kabul.

This policy is flawed. First, there is no guarantee that in the fourth year after the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the Kabul regime can be toppled by force. Nor is there any agreement among the war-mongers on who will rule the land and how. It is also obvious that a majority of the Afghan people want peace, and many among the rebel commanders are ready to negotiate a settlement with Kabul under UN auspices. Introduction of the Big Power negative symmetry will not by itself help to bring peace, because there is no shortage of arms in the region,

and certain countries, unfortunately including Pakistan, do not seem to have changed their Afghan policy. It is necessary to repeat, therefore, that the persisting stalemate in Afghanistan, even if the fighting is desultory, continued to damage Pakistan—on account of the virtually unchecked trade in heroin and illegal arms, and the terrible drain of its resources in greatly straightened circumstances.

Indo-Pakistan Relations

On the eastern front, despite the recent cordial—but brief—meetings between the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India, and the agreement to resume bilateral negotiations, the situation remains virtually deadlocked. Narasimha Rao was provoked, seemingly by the train massacre near Ludhiana, to speak out against Pakistan's alleged promotion of terrorism in East Punjab and Kashmir. The Indian Prime Minister explained that, in his view, the nature of terrorism in other parts of India and the two states bordering Pakistan was radically different, because he concluded that in East Punjab and Kashmir, India faced proxy wars. Such Indian allegations—followed by Pakistani denials and counter-allegations—are not new, but the stern tone used by Prime Minister Rao on this occasion should cause great concern.

Many Indian political parties believe that responsibility for the present situation in East Punjab rests largely with earlier Congress Governments—their actions or inaction. The Darbar Sahib episode and the failure to implement the Rajiv-Gandhi-Longowal accord are cited as the main factors. It seems plain anyhow that in East Punjab, even if there has been interference from the Pakistan side or that refuge has been given to Sikh terrorists seeking asylum, the main problem is domestic and an indigenous solution must be found. On its part, Pakistan has no locus standi or interest in the buffer State, and it must abandon the theory evolved during the Zia dictatorship that it is to Pakistan's advantage to keep the pot boiling in East Punjab so that India cannot think in terms of another Operation Brass Tacks.

Kashmir

The situation in Kashmir, however, is totally different. Pakistan has always had a direct interest in the solution of this prolonged crisis; even if its policy has often been clumsy, at times almost stupid. Here again, there can be no doubt that India's rough handling of the Kashmiri people and their political leaders, including Sheikh Abdullah, created circumstances in which budding militants began to find support among the people. Earlier, the Kashmiris certainly wanted to sort out their problems with India, but very few among them considered it worthwhile to take up arms. This situation was precipitated by people like Jag Mohan who thought that State terrorism would very quickly suppress political terrorism; as should have been anticipated, exactly the reverse has happened. Despite sharp differences leading to clashes among different groups of Kashmiri militants,

there is little evidence to show that the situation can easily be brought under control, even if intervention from this side of the border can be stopped.

Kashmir has a long history of lost opportunities. The present situation is extremely complicated, but it can still be resolved through negotiations among all parties concerned on the basis of justice and fairplay. Nor can the matter be decided now by Pakistan and India without full consultation with the people of Kashmir on both sides of the Line of Control. A settlement should be investigated on the basis of reality on the ground, so that areas whose people are not in doubt about their future destiny are given an early option to decide for themselves. In other regions, consultations should make possible a solution based on recognition of a Kashmiri entity, enjoying a large measure of autonomy, and guaranteeing its peace and prosperity by maintaining links with both its southern and eastern neighbors. Of course, such a solution will not come quickly, but there really is no other option. Therefore, every possible effort should be made by all concerned to put an end to all forms of violence so that the people are given the opportunity to think out their future for themselves—and begin talking.

As for Pakistan, it needs to be stressed that it must give priority to extricating itself from the Afghan tangle and reaching rational agreements with India on pending disputes, before it can even begin to deal with its domestic crises.

Self-Sufficiency in Nuclear Energy Near

92WPO112Z Karachi AMN in Urdu 1 Dec 91 pp 1, 6

[News Report: "Pakistan Will Soon Become Self-Sufficient in Nuclear Energy; Interview With Nuclear Scientist Dr. Qadeer: "We Have the Capability To Enrich Uranium"]

[Text] Quetta, 30 Nov (PPI) "Pakistan is one of the seven countries in the world who are capable of enriching uranium; in order to become self-sufficient and satisfy its energy needs, the country is progressing towards the peaceful goal of its nuclear program." These thoughts were expressed by Pakistan's world renowned scientist, Dr. Abdul Qadeer, in an interview with the PPI. Dr. Qadeer said, "The basic objective of our nuclear program is to attain self-sufficiency in energy needs for the nation's economic, industrial, and social progress." He expressed the hope that, by the grace of God, these objectives would be achieved in the near future. He said, "We have said repeatedly and say it again that Pakistan's nuclear program is of a peaceful nature; but countries who have their own special interests to satisfy, continue their usual propaganda against Pakistan." Comparing Pakistan's nuclear program with that of India, Dr. Qadeer said, "India prepared its nuclear program because of its 1962 war with China when, in confrontation with Chinese troops, Indian forces proved to be mere paper tigers; hence India exploded an nuclear device in 1974 and became an

nuclear power. India has built ballistic missiles and other weapons that prove that the aim of its nuclear program has been to construct atom bombs. Still, India continues to maintain that the objectives of its nuclear program are peaceful." Dr. Qadeer said, "Pakistan, on the other hand, has not done any of those things and is ready to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Pakistan will also allow international inspection of its nuclear installations whereas India does not want to do so." Dr. Qadeer said that Pakistan would not accept discriminatory treatment. He added, "As far as Pakistan's defense is concerned, there is no need for anxiety. Pakistan's defense is in strong hands." Regarding U.S. military aid he said, "We can demonstrate superior performance even without such aid." He added, "U.S. aid annually amounts to 2 dollars per person; with that sum, one can buy a chicken and a half."

Commentary Emphasizes Need To Ban All Nuclear Weapons

92WPO112Y Karachi AMN in Urdu 26 Nov 91 p 2

[Commentary by Juma Khan: "Pakistan Should Construct the Nuclear Bomb and Curse the U.S.A; We Are Not a Shameless Nation: We Will Live Our Lives in Freedom and Dignity; U.S.A's Kindnesses Towards India and Israel; If the Nuclear Bomb Is Dangerous, then its Stockpiles Should Be Destroyed"]

[Text] Bilateral negotiations to restore normal relations have started between Pakistan and the U.S.A. An American general has toured Pakistan and a U.S. under secretary of state for international defense affairs has held talks in Islamabad. Pakistan's position during these talks was that Pakistan is not ready to sacrifice its nuclear program for the sake of normalizing relations with the United States and the U.S.A. has expressed the desire that relations between the two countries remain as friendly as they were in the early part of the 1980's.

If Pakistan persists in continuing its nuclear program in spite of U.S. protests and if the United States continues to withhold aid to Pakistan because of its objections to Pakistan's nuclear program, then what becomes of this talk of friendship? The two countries would be deceiving each other if they said that in spite of the suspension of U.S. aid, friendly relations would continue as before or that if Pakistan kept working on its nuclear program, the United States would consider the suspension of aid a sufficient reaction and would continue its pleasant association with Pakistan.

When a great power suspends aid to a small country, then as long as the aid remains suspended, it is useless even to think of pleasant and friendly relations existing between the two. Similarly, if Pakistan continues its nuclear program in spite of the severe objections of the United States, it is not conceivable that the U.S.A would respect Pakistan's interests.

Cutting off aid is not an ordinary matter; and the suspension of U.S. aid to Pakistan is tantamount to open hostility.

Such an act is not merely unfriendly; Pakistan and the U.S.A. have been friends for more than 40 years and Pakistan has supported the U.S.A. under very difficult circumstances. Pakistan even placed its own safety in danger for the sake of U.S. political, military, and economic interests and allowed the United States, acting on its own military interests, to use Pakistan's territory to spy on Russia and China. If the reward for these sacrifices is that Pakistan's national interests should receive no consideration and U.S. aid to Pakistan be suspended, then one can only say what the people are saying: goodbye to the United States and its friendship. Our people now are openly saying, build the nuclear bomb and curse the U.S.A.

The Indian nation is the second largest in the world [in territory] and in population, India is the second largest country; but relations among nations are not measured in terms of territory and population. However big or small a country's territory or population, it enjoys the same status as all other countries. Relations among countries are established on the basis of equality; the world does not accept the rule that one should have good relations with large countries but should ignore small countries. In the brotherhood of nations, Bhutan enjoys the same status as China.

India exploded an nuclear device in 1974 but up to now Pakistan has not done so. India does not allow international inspection of its nuclear centers and is not ready to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Pakistan's position is that it will sign the treaty if India does so as well. But India maintains that it will not sign the agreement irrespective of whether Pakistan does so or not. Nevertheless, the U.S.A. has accused Pakistan of trying to construct an nuclear bomb and has halted aid but has not placed any restrictions on aid to India. At one point, aid to India was suspended but it was later restored even though India neither promised to refrain from constructing an nuclear bomb nor did it sign the nonproliferation treaty.

Pakistan had suggested that South Asia be made a nuclear free zone but India turned down the proposal. Pakistan had also suggested that Russia, the U.S.A. and China bring about an agreement between India and Pakistan not to construct nuclear bombs. All other countries liked the suggestion but India's answer was in the negative. Then Pakistan tried to have the organization of South Asian [Association for Regional Cooperation] countries, SAARC, sign the nonproliferation treaty; but India postponed the SAARC leadership conference in order to prevent any discussion on Pakistan's proposal.

In view of these facts, is the suspension of U.S. aid to Pakistan and the continuation of U.S. aid to India based on justice?

The attitude of the United States shows that it wants Indian hegemony in South Asia; it wants to abandon Pakistan to India's tender mercies and wishes even to see Pakistan become dependent on India.

Pakistan is a small country compared to India; but it is inhabited by a dignified nation that will die for its honor. This nation has a single ideology and is ready to sacrifice everything for its safety; it does not wish to live a life of ignominy. It holds very dear the message of its leaders that it is better to live one day like a lion than a hundred years like a jackal [synonym for a coward].

We cannot live as anyone's slaves. We will live in dignity and freedom; we do not choose to live in a cage, even a golden one.

By stopping aid to Pakistan because of its nuclear program and by continuing its aid to India, the United States has been unjust. If the United States acknowledges its mistake and begins to treat all countries evenhandedly, then Pakistan will not complain; but it is international injustice if, for the same act, one country is punished while another is granted patronage. As long as the United States follows this two-faced policy, it will not have the friendship, or even the pretence of friendship, of Pakistan and its people.

The U.S. Government, under its new world order, had decided to recall all its troops from South Korea; but it has now changed its mind and made the withdrawal of its troops from South Korea contingent upon North Korea announcing that it would not construct a nuclear bomb. North Korea is also being pressured to allow international inspection of its nuclear centers. The United States will not gain anything by pursuing such policies. If the United States does not withdraw its troops from South Korea, would that decision induce North Korea to abandon its plan of constructing a nuclear bomb? And if North Korea does construct such a bomb, what action can U.S. troops take against it? Dignified nations do not yield to pressure and force. The U.S. Government should adopt diplomatic methods; but it has taken a big stick in hand and is trying to push all nations with it. Such behavior will give the United States a bad international reputation.

It is surprising that in order to prevent a Muslim Middle Eastern country, Iraq, from acquiring nuclear technology, the United States had its puppet Israel bomb the Iraqi nuclear plant. Pakistan has been threatened through various sources that if it does not abandon its nuclear program, Israel may bomb its nuclear plant as well. But though well aware that Israel is building a nuclear bomb, no pressure was put on it. Why is it that the United States has failed to induce Israel to sign the nonproliferation treaty but is giving Israel the largest amount of economic and military aid? Does this not prove that the United States wishes to make Israel the largest unconquerable military force in the Middle East?

Some time ago, Iran tried to establish contacts with China and India in order to obtain nuclear technology.

The United States at once sent high-level delegations to both countries and forced them to abandon any nuclear cooperation with Iran because Iran had not signed the nuclear nonproliferation agreement. In principle India had agreed to give nuclear help to Iran; but India was bribed and pressured into abandoning the transfer of nuclear technology. It is not known what answer China gave to the United States; but China follows a policy that acknowledges in principle the right of every country to progress and believes that if progress in any special field is to be abandoned, then it should be done with mutual consent.

The United States was the first to construct a nuclear bomb and China was the last; only five countries, Russia, the United States, France, Britain, and China possess nuclear bombs. Since the idea of the atomic bomb was conceived, only two such bombs have been used. These were dropped some 46 years ago on the two Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing hundreds of thousands of people. Only the United States has dropped atomic bombs; the other four nuclear powers have never used the bomb against anyone even though they were also engaged in wars and each possessed thousands of bombs, each one thousands of times more powerful than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

All five countries consider the nuclear bomb the most lethal weapon, each bomb capable of killing hundreds of thousands of people; but the United Nations has not banned the nuclear bomb. The United States doesn't want any other country, except the five who already possess it, to construct nuclear bombs; but it cannot answer the question as to why such a lethal weapon should remain in the possession of the United States and the other four countries. If it is dangerous for other countries to possess a nuclear bomb, how can the stockpile of nuclear weapons in the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China be considered safe?

India also wants the destruction of all nuclear weapons and it wants all countries to sign an agreement not to construct nuclear bombs; in other words, nuclear weapons should be banned. It would indeed be discrimination if five countries continued to build nuclear bombs while other countries were told not to do so.

In the recent failed military coup in the Soviet Union, nuclear bombs were in danger of falling into rebel hands; thus, nuclear bombs are not safe in any country. What is needed is that stockpiles of nuclear weapons in all countries should be destroyed and the weapons banned.

Editorial Calls For Better Protection of Nuclear Facilities

92WPO112X Karachi JANG in Urdu 23 Nov 91 p 3

[Editorial: "Arrangements Made for Safeguarding Nuclear Installations"]

[Text] Mohammad Sadiq Kanju, federal minister for foreign affairs, speaking in the senate on a motion for

adjournment, said that although an agreement had been signed between India and Pakistan in which each country pledged not to attack the other's nuclear installations, nevertheless, in view of the conspiracy between India and Israel concerning Pakistan's nuclear installations and the presence of Israeli experts in occupied Kashmir, Pakistan had made all necessary arrangements for the protection of its nuclear installations and that the government was fully aware of the possibility of an attack. In this connection he announced that an attack on Pakistan's nuclear installations would be tantamount to a declaration of war and that an attack would provoke a similar retaliation. Pakistan's nuclear program is aimed solely at alleviating the energy crisis and Pakistan is continuing the program for peaceful purposes. But because of the conspiracy between Jews and Hindus, Western media are constantly maligning Pakistan on the international level. In this atmosphere of suspicion, the United States has stopped aid to Pakistan. There is no doubt about the enmity that India and Israel feel towards Islam; hence, because of their constant plots against Pakistan's nuclear installations, Pakistan's safety depends on its vigilance and preparedness at every level. India has paid little attention to its past agreements with Pakistan and cannot be trusted to observe the terms of any new agreement. In view of this fact, the necessity of preparedness at all times for the defense of our borders and sensitive installations cannot be neglected even for a moment.

Editorial Cautions Against Compromise on Nuclear Program

*92AS0405C Lahore MUSAWAT in Urdu 24 Nov 91
p 3*

[Editorial: "Why Should There Be Bargaining Over the Nuclear Program?"]

[Text] The people will never allow any bargaining over the nuclear program because the leader of the people, the martyred Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, confronted imperialism on behalf of Islam and the people of the Third World as a result of which he was hanged. The people of Pakistan will never allow the government to make any deals on the nuclear program. The superpowers want to establish control over the Islamic and the Third World and the people of Pakistan will not allow anyone to bargain over the nuclear program. Pakistan and the countries of the Third World have to work at present for development and progress in order to solve the basic problems facing the people and to save them from poverty, disease, and ignorance. The position of Benazir Bhutto, the leader of the opposition party and cochairperson of the People's Party, is to a great extent the same. Pakistan and the countries of South Asia should not make nuclear weapons and India should also stop building such weapons. The proliferation of nuclear weapons in South Asia should be stopped in the same way that the United States and Russia are preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. The people of South Asia are suffering from disease, ignorance, and poverty. The

path to war is the path to destruction and the people of Pakistan and other Asian countries want peace. Pakistan's nuclear program is aimed at achieving development and progress. There is a serious shortage of energy in Pakistan, which is having an effect on development programs. Pakistan wants to use nuclear energy to compensate for the shortage of electricity. The United States agrees with this position to a great extent but it does not want uranium enrichment.

Pakistan wants to free itself from economic and political slavery because without such freedom no country can call itself independent or in control of its own destiny. We made some efforts in the past towards this goal but we were unsuccessful. Viewed in the context of the international situation, the present conditions in the country demand a united approach. Hence, it is necessary that a widely representative national government be established and that the people unite to deal with the new situation because a new world system is being born under the new world order.

The Indian foreign minister has termed Pakistan's proposal regarding nuclear weapons unreliable and has said that there would be no sudden change in Indian policy nor would India sign the nonproliferation treaty. India's foreign minister has also leveled the charge that Pakistan's proposal ignores China's nuclear capability. Pakistan wants South Asia to remain totally free of nuclear weapons but India does not agree and considers such a proposal impractical. During talks in Delhi with Madhavsinh Solanki, India's foreign minister, Bartholomew, the U.S. under secretary of state, took account of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and made suggestions. In order to restrict nuclear weapons in South Asia, a meeting of the United States, Soviet Union, China, India, and Pakistan should be held. The proposal of nuclear free South Asia deserves study and the countries involved should study the implementation of the suggestion.

As far as Pakistan is concerned, it should give serious thought to the establishment of a widely based national government because without it we will have no place of refuge under the new world order. Iraq was bombed all over in the Gulf war following which the entire Arab world has fallen into a state of helplessness. All Arab countries have accepted Israeli dominance. Today one power rules the world and it will not accept any Islamic country attaining nuclear power. After the threat of communism disappeared, this power used the Pressler Amendment to stop aid to Pakistan, which affected Pakistan directly and caused it to have various problems. The world of Islam was crippled by means of the Gulf war. Pakistan cannot now bargain over its nuclear program. This program is peaceful and we should not abandon it. Pakistan wants to raise the standard of living of its people and it needs electricity to do so; but there is a severe shortage of electricity in the country. Pakistan can satisfy its needs through nuclear energy and can bring problems such as poverty, disease, and ignorance under control. The unity and singleness of purpose,

which is sorely needed today, is totally lacking in the country and the basic reason is that the ruling authorities are following the Western maxim of divide and conquer. As a consequence, there are confrontations on every corner and every street. If we do not unite as a dignified nation over the principles of "Unity, faith and order," we will never enjoy a national identity. We should protect our national interests as true Muslim Pakistanis. If we neglect to do so, the coming generations will never forgive us and history will not remember us kindly. We should not hesitate making any sacrifice to maintain the dignity, integrity, and independence of Pakistan. The suggestion of U.S. Under Secretary of State Bartholomew that a joint meeting of the United States, the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan be summoned to study the restriction of nuclear weapons in South Asia deserves study; but there should be no bargaining over the nuclear program.

Leaders Seen as 'Traditional,' Incapable of Revolution

92AS0453A Lahore NIDA in Urdu 15 Dec 91 pp 6-8, 30

[Article by Abdul Karim Aabid: "Pakistan Situation in International Politics"]

[Text] Mr. Reginald Bartholomew, the U.S. under secretary of state, did not visit Pakistan just as a formality. Pakistani leaders were anxiously awaiting this visit, and this trip had been canceled repeatedly because the United States did not want a visit from such an important person to be without effective results. It wanted to send him to Pakistan at a time when it had made up its mind about these issues, and when Pakistan had also has taken a stand or at least was close to it. The United States expected Pakistan to be close enough to agreement that it could avoid any serious conflicts. Otherwise, this trip would not only have been useless but also would have increased friction between the two countries. In this context, Mr. Bartholomew's visit in itself was important progress and we can conclude that the stalemate on this issue has been broken.

One important development was that the U.S. under secretary paid attention to Pakistan's point of view and gave importance to it. After the Gulf war, U.S. leaders had stopped listening to other people and began simply to say their own things. Their attitudes were ridiculous. This time around, Pakistan's point of view was not only listened to, but also efforts were made to understand it. One reason for this was the involvement of China. Visits by its leaders to Pakistan had alerted the U.S.A.

Our intellectuals have repeatedly said that the United States does not need Pakistan now that the Cold war has ended. The United States had also adopted an attitude to support this hypothesis; however, Pakistan's geographic location is such that its importance just cannot be ignored. It was also a psychological strategy of the United States, which wanted to make Pakistan feel

inadequate and force it to believe that it was not important enough to have any dealings with it. The United States used our intellectuals as part of this psychological warfare. The fact is that Pakistan's importance has not decreased since the Gulf war; it has actually increased. The reason for this is that Iran is confronting the United States on one side, while China is challenging the U.S. new world order on the other side. In addition, there are the Islamic campaigns against the United States in the Arab and Islamic countries. Pakistan has the capability to influence opinion in Arab countries.

The United States believes that the hatred against it would increase if Islamic campaigns in Muslim countries were crushed through the rulers there. Therefore, the United States and the West are looking for such Islamic leaders to show moderation and flexibility to deal with the United States. The old-time emperors, sheiks, and emirs do not fit this description. The movement for democracy will not leave them in their present positions. The United States would like them to be replaced by more moderate and liberal Islamic leadership. In this context, Pakistan is important because its leaders follow an Islamic system that does not create problems for the United States. The United States is willing to go ahead and be friendly with the brothers in the Arab world, who show a middle of the road and realistic attitude. It supports those who do not follow the revolutionary path taken by Iran, and are willing to work within the framework of a democratic system. Pakistan is important in this context, and the United States can counter the anti-U.S. campaigns in the Middle East and the rest of the Islamic world by making Pakistan its ally.

An Egyptian intellectual recently wrote a booklet that proposes a third option for the Islamic world. This option asks Muslims to raise the Islamic flag and destroy secularism; however, he also suggests that this approach be taken to improve relations with the West and the Christian world. It suggested that Muslims resolve their issues in a way such that Islam is protected and there is no confrontation with the West. This third option is very appropriate and convenient for Pakistani leaders.

The United States knows well that Pakistan will not become another Iran, and that it can be made a U.S. ally with a little effort. Pakistan has been a U.S. ally with its Islam in the past, and it cannot object to being an ally in the future, if the conflicts between the two countries are resolved. These issues include the nuclear development and Pakistan's defense forces. The United States wants to impose restrictions on these. It asks that these be limited to a certain extent. Whenever Pakistan passes these limits, it must stop further developments. The United States is also seeing the emerging Soviet central Asia, where Pakistan's relations may not be more than those of Iran and Turkey, but are no less. Kazakhstan is also in this region, where the Soviet nuclear installations are situated. Tajikistan is not only right next to Afghanistan, but it can also be affected by Afghanistan's religious movement. Against this background, if the United

States keeps Pakistan on its side, then it can use it to control the situation in this region.

There is no doubt that India is ready to become a puppet in the hands of the United States. America, however, needs a country that can play an important role in the Islamic world by bearing an Islamic flag. India cannot be very effective in this context; it has made new economic pacts with Central Asian republics very fast, while Pakistan is demonstrating a passive attitude toward it. Still, the Central Asian republics support Pakistan more than any other country, and India's economic and cultural pacts with these republics are not very important. India is trying to impress the United States with the fact that it has control over Tibet and the Dalai Lama. The West can use India's services to harm China through Tibet. The Dalai Lama visited Europe recently and talked with European leaders. India believes that the West will help a Tibetan campaign the same way it had lavished aid to Pakistan in the Afghanistan campaign. At the same time, if Pakistan adopts an anti-U.S. attitude by cooperating with China, then India could offer its services to the United States to teach a lesson to Pakistan. The United States, however, knows that a clash with China would not be appropriate.

China has also started economic reforms. Its private sector is flourishing, factories have been installed with foreign investment, and small-scale industries and businesses are increasing. These include such businesses as beauty clinics to boutiques. Because of its private industrial economy, China's exports have increased significantly, and the United States has still adopted the most favored nation clause about China, despite opposition by the American Congress. China earned \$10 billion from the United States last year, and is expected to earn \$12 billion this year. Thus, by changing the economic system, China will gradually become a capitalist country. It is in a period of great difficulty because of the losses it is suffering in nationalized industries; it is therefore moving towards privatization. If these economic reforms are successful and no problems arise within China, then China will slowly change into capitalist economic system. The issue of basic rights is not an important one to the United States of America, even though it makes a lot of noise about it. The real problem is that it does not want China to provide nuclear and missile technology to Islamic countries. Mr. James Baker, the U.S. secretary of state, was successful in this effort during his recent visit. It is further expected that India's dream of being used by the United States against China and receiving American aid will not become true. The United States is gradually becoming aware of the fact that it needs Pakistan and not India in the Islamic world and Central Asia; however, the nuclear issue is hindering relations with Pakistan.

When Senate Chairman Wasim Sajjad went to Washington, D.C., no one was willing to talk nicely to him; however, important American leaders are now coming here to see us, and are telling us that a solution to this problem will be found. Pakistani leaders were well-prepared to negotiate when the important American

leaders arrived here. They had worked hard to prepare themselves. The prime minister, president, and the commander in chief of the armed forces discussed all issues very carefully. They had agreed to use one voice when talking to the American leaders. They did not want conflicts on any issue. It was decided that U.S. aid should not be emphasized. This aid is for \$235 million, and Pakistan can live without it. Military equipment and spare parts can be purchased in the open market on cash payment. The U.S. military aid to Pakistan is limited to \$100 million. Pakistan can spend that amount for its defense on its own. The United States also has to help the Soviet Union and East European countries. At the same time, it is suffering from an economic crisis at home, and it does not have much capability to provide aid. Therefore, our leaders decided not to demand U.S. aid; instead, they chose to tell the United States to consider our long-term friendship, which should continue in the future also. The difference that the nuclear issue has caused between the two countries should be resolved through negotiations, and should not reach such a dangerous level. They wanted to salvage U.S.-Pakistan relations at any cost.

Pakistan's approach to holding talks definitely impressed the U.S. under secretary. Now the United States has begun to understand that it is not appropriate to put all its pressure on Pakistan alone. It knows that it should recognize the nuclear issue as a regional one, and call for a conference of the United States, the Soviet Union, China, India, and Pakistan, as suggested by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. This proposal was initiated by Mr. Nawaz Sharif, however, the United States liked it, and it was presented at the behest of the United States. The U.S. under secretary discussed this proposal in New Delhi after leaving Pakistan. The pressure is now on India. Pakistan's Government has also declared that it does not support the "fundamentalists." The appointment of Akram Zaki as general secretary of the foreign ministry, Begum Abida Hussein's appointment as ambassador to the United States of America, and an association between Wali Khan and ANP [Awami National Party] all show that even though we carry the flag of Islam, this Islam is not against the United States of America or liberal thinking. Keeping all this in mind, it would be appropriate to say that the Pakistani leaders who support traditional Islam will not become leaders of revolutionary Islam, even if they want to. The problem is not limited to Islam only; there are India's ambitions to become a supreme power and U.S. support for these ambitions. These facts will make our traditional Muslims into fundamentalists and give rise to anti-U.S. politics in this region. Opposed to this, if a resolution to the Kashmir problem is found with U.S. assistance, both countries agree to sign some nuclear pact, and agree to reduce defense spending, then the faction that wants to end Hindu-Muslim enmity as well as Pakistan-India enmity will become stronger. This will help produce an atmosphere of understanding in the subcontinent.

Even those people who want to expand Islam also consider an atmosphere of understanding and peace

important in this region. It is difficult to explain to Hindus about Islam in this environment of animosity. If an atmosphere of understanding is prevalent in the subcontinent, then Islam will definitely benefit from it. Therefore, we should have an understanding with India because of the needs of Islam and our nation, and not because the United States tells us to do so. The question, however, is whether the United States will be able to prepare India for this understanding. If it expects to tie Pakistan's hands and feet and throw it in front of India, then it will not be able to solve this matter.

The nuclear issue related to Pakistan is the product of India's designs of aggression. If India did not have these designs, then we would not have any need to look for nuclear weapons. It is commonly believed now that we cannot stop Indian aggression without a nuclear bomb. In this context, it would not be enough for India to sign a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. It should also have an agreement that India's strength does not grow to the point that it becomes a danger to Pakistan. Pakistan needs specific assurances for its defense and security. This assurance should not be given by another party; Pakistan should be allowed to have enough military power to stop India from thinking about attacking it. If an atmosphere of understanding is encouraged in the subcontinent, then both countries will voluntarily take the path of reduction in arms and armed forces.

The U.S. under secretary listened to Pakistan's official viewpoint about it with an open mind, and perhaps he was somewhat impressed. In addition, the United States needs Pakistan because of its geographic and cultural importance. Therefore, it just cannot ignore Pakistan's viewpoint. The real problem is that we must make an erudite decision about whether we should be identified with the Islamic image, which the West dislikes and calls "fundamentalist." Is any agreement with the United States beneficial to us? Will we benefit by compromising our religions or is it a deal of total loss? It is also

important that our leaders are united, and that the opposition is included in their united voice. It is unwise not to include a major party in forming national policy. As for Pakistan's relations with China and Iran, these should be increased; however, we should keep in mind that there is a conflict between the extremists and moderates in Iran, and we do not know who will win this struggle. China is not in the mood for any extremist policy either. The visits of the Chinese leaders to India and its relations with Israel show that China is keeping an eye on changing world politics and is not in the mood for any conflict. Therefore, it would be wrong to assume that China will jump in the arena to help us. It should be clear that it does not matter how friendly Iran and China are with us; we cannot help them in any war, and they cannot help us in any campaigns either. Therefore, Pakistan's international politics should be in accordance with the situation here and its capabilities. In order to make our foreign policy strong, we must strengthen our internal policy.

One important issue is related to Afghanistan. The United States has viewed our government's stand on it with satisfaction; however, it has put the responsibility on Pakistan to convince the mujahidin to agree to a political solution and have them cooperate with each other to achieve this goal. The United States suspects that there are still some elements in the ISI [Inter Services Intelligence] and the military who support providing weapons to groups in Afghanistan. Pakistan's Government is discussing this issue with Saudi Arabia and Iran. It will be beneficial for Pakistan if a peaceful resolution of this issue is found. If this does not happen, then the results of the Afghan civil war will fall on us, which will present a great danger to us. If the Afghan problem is resolved, then we will have new opportunities for trade and cultural relations with central Asia. It is very difficult to say now whether this problem will be resolved now or a permanent civil war will start in Afghanistan making it a regular battle ground for the tribal wars. This would be a great misfortune for Pakistan.

Trade Unionists Call It 'Constant Battle'

92AS0460D Lahore VIEWPOINT in English
9 Jan 92 pp 15-16

[Article by Husain Sajjad]

[Text] "We are in a constant battle with the increasing inflation as we know that we have to fight to survive", says Mr Khushi Mohammad Khokhar, the President of the Punjab Irrigation Employees Federation. He says that despite all the claims by the Government that the rising prices will be checked, the concerned authorities have failed to do so. The poor have been compelled to opt for cheaper goods, but it seems that nothing is within their reach. Mr Khokhar adds that once the Landa Bazar was considered to be the cheapest secondhand garment market but now even there, prices have increased a lot. He says that distributive injustices are creating conditions which lead to a bloody revolution. "I have a television and a telephone but I use it sparingly for fear of heavy bills. Cutting down on consumption is the only way in which we can live within diminishing means."

Mr Khokhar is of the view that the elite is playing the role of with the consumer and the producer and they can afford to buy the things at any price. And they demand their own price when they sell. They have little concern for those with limited means. The only thing they want is the maximum of profits with the minimum of effort. Meatless days are for the poor, and not on Tuesdays and Wednesdays but for most of the month. The affluent, on the other hand, have their refrigerators full of the choicest cuts of mutton and beef.

Purchasing Power

The purchasing power of the rupee has fallen dramatically since the sixties when one could make do with seventy rupees a month, he says.

Mr Haq Nawaz Kausari, the General Secretary of the Pakistan PWD [Public Works Department] Workers Council says that the price control committees set up by the government should at least control the rates of essential goods. Most poor people like himself were living at the subsistence level. "Because if high prices, we have been obliged to use washing soap as toilet soap. Our children have no knowledge of the economic situation and they keep pestering us with embarrassing questions."

Mr Kausari says that together with the increase in prices, the quality of the goods on sale has deteriorated steadily. "This is double inflation. Let me tell you how. Last year quality meat sold for, say, Rs[rupees]30 to the kilo. Today, rotten meat sells for Rs 60. That makes the rate of inflation 200 and not 100 percent."

The anti-adulteration campaign launched by the Government, he says, has been a complete failure and traders have blackmailed the Administration into giving them a carte blanche for their criminal activities. Mr Kausari admits that wages and salaries have risen over the years

but not in keeping with the rate of inflation. "Incomes have been eroded. That which you could buy for a hundred rupees twenty years ago will now require a thousand rupees at the minimum.

Mr Khursheed Ahmed, the General Secretary of the All Pakistan Trade Unions Federation, feels that deficit financing resorted to by the Government to meet its expenses has stoked the flames of inflation more than anything else. Inflation, he says, is a worldwide phenomenon and Pakistan cannot be immune to it. Foreign details are another reason for the inflationary pressures on the economy. "We can call them imported inflation," he says. Mr Khurshid Ahmed is critical of the capitalists and landlords. "They are parasites eating into the economy," he says.

Inflation, he says, has hit the fixed income groups the hardest. The concentration of wealth in a few hands has led to all-round poverty. "A handful live in obscene affluence while the majority does not know where its next meal with come from," he says and proposes heavy taxes on luxury goods. "Those who can afford to pay must be made to do so."

Minimum Wages

Minimum wages should be revised upwards to at least Rs 3,000, as promised by the IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] at election time. Prices can be brought down by eliminating the middle-man who makes more money than the producer. Once the middleman goes, people could get things cheaply at wholesale markets and at utility stores.

Mr Khursheed says that self-reliance is essential it improves the national economy. Instead of exporting raw material, Pakistan should sell value-added goods abroad. He is of the view that industrial development is necessary to increase job opportunities and for self-reliance. However, industrial productivity cannot be improved without putting an end to feudal and capitalist exploitation. "Give the worker his due and the economy will take off sooner than you expect," he concludes.

Economic Problems Analyzed, Solutions Forecast

92AS0456A Lahore MUSAWAT in Urdu 16 Dec 91 p 3

[Editorial: "Serious Crisis of National Economy"]

[Text] Sardar Farooq Ahmed Khan Lughari, deputy opposition leader, said that "the national economy was facing a crisis and the leaders have pushed the nation to the brink of bankruptcy. He said that surplus of currency was on the increase and the prices of necessary items increased 20 percent last year. The IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] government will now impose new taxes to raise 20 billion rupees because of the agreement with the IMF. The cost of telephone and electricity have been increased for the same reason." He expressed concern over the policy on cotton and said that the farmers were suffering because of lower prices of domestic animals.

He said that cotton made up 95 percent of agricultural production in Saraiki-speaking areas and demanded that the prices of cotton be increased. He said that the PPP [Pakistan People's Party] will oppose such an increase and that it will hold a public meeting in Multan on 25 December. He said, "The nation is being threatened both from within and abroad. Dissension and lawlessness is rampant. Only a national government can save the nation from drowning in quicksand. Terrorism has become routine and no segment of our life is spared. Our government has failed to solve national problems. Foreign pressure is increasing to accept India's supremacy. Pakistan is being asked to yield on the Kashmir issue. The IJI government is abusing national resources relentlessly. The expenditures have increased so much that we need to impose taxes worth 56 billion rupees [Rs] to run the country. Steps are being taken to reduce the budget deficit from 7 percent to 4.8 percent just to meet the IMF requirements. New problems have emerged due to devaluation of the rupee. The U.S. dollar has risen from Rs 21.60 to Rs 26.00. New currency notes worth Rs 15 billion have been issued during the last 50 days. After this, the amount of currency in circulation has increased from Rs 1,031,610,000,000 to Rs 1,046,560,000,000. The value of currency in circulation has increased by 5

billion rupees during the last week. The money circulation was reduced after the visit by the IMF and World Bank delegations. The efforts are to leave the situation as it is. We are suffering from economic, social, and aging problems. Injustice is rampant, and the masses are being crushed under atrocious actions. No one is safe. Political instability and warfare between various groups must end so that they can focus on protecting the rights of the people. The people should have the amenities and facilities to live and lead respectful lives. Otherwise, political stability and economic progress will be mere dreams. The work to build a national economy that should have been completed was never started in our country. We raised slogans about self-sufficiency, but never paid any attention to creating an atmosphere conducive to such development. We have this competing for a false standard of life and waste on unnecessary ceremonies. People are running like crazy in this competition, and every person is living beyond his means. Just to attain this, people will get money by hook or by crook. All vices, such as graft, smuggling, and nepotism, are increasing rapidly. We must make a firm decision to live simply and by Islamic principles. We must take a vow to get rid of those vices and unnecessary expenses.

U.S. General Meets Counterparts To Discuss Relations

92AS0336B Lahore MUSAWAT in Urdu 20 Nov 91

[Editorial: "Pak-U.S. Relations"]

[Text] U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, Nicholas, stated that following the Monday meetings between General Joseph Lee, commander in chief of the U.S. central command, and Pakistani generals, relations between the two countries had been reestablished at the highest military level. General Howar met individually not only with the Pakistan chief of army staff general Asaf Nawaz but other generals as well. Thus, relations between Pak-U.S. armed forces that had been affected for several decades, were restored. After March, 1990, there were no contacts at the highest level between Pakistan and the United States.

The explanation of the U.S. commander in chief that relations with India had not been established at Pakistan's cost was a timely one. During talks at GHQ, he said that whenever possible, there would be military cooperation with Pakistan within the limits of the Pressler Amendment and that until the solution of the nuclear issues, armaments made in U.S. factories for Pakistan would not be given to any other country. Also, that the United States would try to provide Pakistan with returnable [spare] parts for defense equipment and would not shut down the office of the U.S. military representative.

The Pakistani Government has said that during the negotiations, it would not enter into any deals concerning the nuclear program and would not sign the nonproliferation treaty unless India did so as well. Pakistan needs scientific and technical knowledge in order to make progress in such fields as development and reconstruction; that was why Benazir Bhutto, cochairperson of the Pakistan People's Party, said in a press conference in Larkana that she was ready to accept U.S. aid. Pakistan's nuclear energy program, the restoring of military aid to Pakistan and such other issues are being discussed in the Pak-U.S. talks. The effect of the Pressler Amendment on Pakistan is also being discussed.

The United States has on several occasions in the past wasted opportunities relating to Pakistan's safety and has harmed its own interests as well. Mutual relations should be based on pleasant and friendly equality; but our past relations were those of shopkeeper and customer. Relations should now improve; after relinquishing its nuclear program, Pakistan would be assured of protection from an nuclear war. But this is not practicable nor is it a fundamental issue. Pakistan's geographical situation is such as to keep it concerned about its safety. India continues its military and war preparations and daily increases its defensive strength. That is why it keeps seeking pretexts for expansion. India is an nuclear power; if it attacks Pakistan with an nuclear bomb or nuclear weapons, then the United States will come to Pakistan's aid. This is good reassurance; but if

India were to attack Pakistan with conventional weapons as it has done three times in the past, then the U.S. nuclear guarantee agreement will be useless and the United States will as usual remain a silent spectator. It would be childish to think that if India should drop an nuclear bomb on Pakistan, the United States would attack India with bombers loaded with nuclear bombs. Most of Pakistan's friends did not give it any timely aid in the past. Friends disappointed us when Dacca fell and Pakistan lost its arm.

The United States has influence in the Pak-India sub-continent; it should help to solve longstanding problems between Pakistan and India and thus create an atmosphere of good understanding and an end to the weapons race. War preparations and weapons accumulation are wasting the resources of the two countries. These poor Third World countries are facing economic and financial problems; they continue to waste their resources while for the last 40 years the problems of the people have remained unsolved. It is a matter of satisfaction that the U.N. General Assembly's political committee passed Pakistan's resolution offering a guarantee of safety to those countries who have no nuclear weapons. No one voted against the resolution and for the first time, both the Soviet Union and France supported it. But nuclear powers still hesitate to openly support Pakistan's stand. In the talks between Pakistan and the United States, false propaganda by opponents and efforts to create difficulties for Pakistan will be discussed. On the one hand, the United States and Britain keep pressuring Pakistan to limit its nuclear program and not carry it beyond a certain point, but on the other hand, when a concrete and meaningful proposal is made, they hesitate to support it. We do not regard this behavior on the part of nuclear powers as just; their attitude is improper and fraught with serious dangers for world peace. These countries should try to rise above so-called political interests and considerations and understand Pakistan's realistic position. Israel, South Africa, and India are regarded as being exempt from all laws and regulations. They possess nuclear weapons and they have exploded nuclear devices. Pakistan, on the other hand, is suffering an energy crisis, which is having an effect on all its development programs and projects. Pakistan wants to overcome its shortcomings through an nuclear program. The world is aware of the destructive force of an nuclear bomb; the effects of the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki still linger on. In reality, the survival and safety of mankind demands that all nuclear weapons should be destroyed and all plans for further production of such weapons be ended. The billions of dollars that are spent on nuclear weapons should be used for launching a worldwide campaign to eradicate disease, poverty, and ignorance.

High-Level Changes in Army Reported

92AS0452E Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 24 Dec 91
pp 1,7

[News Report: "High-Level Transfers in Army"]

[Text] Islamabad (Correspondent)—It has been learned that some high-level changes have been made in

Pakistan's armed forces. Lieutenant General Hamid Niaz, master general of ordnance, has been transferred. In his place, Lieutenant General Tanvir Hussein Naqvi, commandant of command and staff college, Quetta, has been appointed master general of ordnance. Gen. Naqvi will assume his new responsibilities soon. Major General Ali Qali Khan, commander of an infantry division, has been appointed to the post of commandant of command and staff college, Quetta. It has also been learned that no final decision has been made about the appointment of Lt. Gen. Hamid Gul as the corps commander of Multan. Meanwhile, Major Gen. Karamat Jahangir, director general of military operations, has been appointed in his place as temporary corps commander. His promotion is expected soon, after which he will be a permanent corps commander in Multan. A decision will be made soon about Lt. Gen. Hamid Nawaz as master general of ordnance.

Success Reported in Upgrade of F-16

92AS0452C Lahore NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 13 Dec 91 p 11

[News Report: "Pakistan Upgrades F-16 Engine"]

[Text] Hazro (Correspondent)—The Pakistan Aeronautical Complex in Kamra has started to overhaul and upgrade the F-100 engines of the F-16 airplane in its Mirage rebuilding factory. Air Vice Marshal Mazmal Sayyed was a special guest at a ceremony to announce this development at the factory. The first upgraded and overhauled engine was presented to the Pakistan Air

Force. Pakistan is now the second nation after the United States of America in which these engines can be upgraded. This has helped improve the use of the airplanes. The airplanes that were capable of flying 1,800 hours in the past can now fly for up to 4,000 hours. Air Vice Marshal Sayyed said in his address that "a new chapter has begun in this factory after the initiation of this project." He said that "the way the engineers and talented technicians of this organization have implemented this plan and overhauled and upgraded the engines in spite of the suspension of U.S. aid is extremely commendable." He added that "we are implementing our plan of self-reliance and are emphasizing production in our own country, rather than depending on foreign assistance." Before him, Commodore Azhar Hussein, managing director of the factory, said in his speech that he was instructed to upgrade and overhaul F-100 engines after the 1985 directive for defense production. "This plan was started in 1990. After making preliminary preparations, U.S. aid was stopped during this period, and we had to face many difficulties. The technicians and officials in this factory managed not only to overhaul but also upgrade the engine because of their hard work and dedication." He thanked the leadership and experience of Air Commander Akbar Mehdi and U.S. expert Mr. Benizan. In addition to Dr. General B.A.C. Kamra, Air Vice Marshal Mohammed Yusuf Khan, Air Commodore Imtyaz Rasul Khan, managing director of MDF-6, the AMF [expansion not given], Air Commander Abdul Haider of the radar factory, Air Commander Mohammed Irshad, and engineers and technicians working on F-100 participated in the ceremony.

Supreme Court Dictates Civil Service To Be Apolitical

92AS0459D Lahore VIEWPOINT in English 2 Jan 92
pp 14-15

[Quotation marks as published]

[Text] The Supreme Court has held that the civil service should essentially be apolitical in character to enable the democratic system to work.

This observation was made by a three-member Bench of the Court comprising Mr. Justice Saad Saud Jan and Mr. Justice Ajmal Mian and headed by the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Afzal Zullah, in civil appeals Nos. 228, 371 and 327 of 1989.

The Court observed that if this principle was not upheld, every change in the political complexion of the government which was a basic feature of democracy, the entire services will need to be replaced leading to utter chaos.

The Court observed: "Those who framed our Constitution took steps to keep the civil service out of the political arena. Thus, while providing in Article 17(2) that every citizen shall have the right to form and be a member of a political party, they made an exception in the case of the services of Pakistan. If the 'hiring and firing' of civil servants is to be influenced by political considerations, the civil service can hardly be expected to retain a neutral character."

Two of the respondents in the appeal were appointed as chowkidars, and one as a sweeper in different schools and in a sub-divisional educational office in Lakki Marwat on the recommendations of the local members of the Provincial Assembly and the Minister for Education.

Subsequently however, the appointments were terminated in order to accommodate the appellants who were also the nominees of the members of the Provincial Assembly. They agitated against the termination of their services but as they did not receive a favourable response, they filed appeals before the Provincial Services Tribunal, which set aside the termination orders and directed their reinstatement with all back benefits. However, the appellants also moved to the Supreme Court.

The Court also referred to various Articles pertaining to the fundamental rights of the citizens and announced that a larger bench be formed to hear the appeals. The questions on the grounds of which leave to appeal was granted were:

(a) Whether members of the legislative assemblies or Ministers act within the powers and jurisdiction to get appointments made to government offices and posts.

(b) Whether they cannot 'interfere' with the rights of the civil servants.

(c) Whether they are bound by the procedure prescribed for the appointment of government servants.

(d) Whether, in the context of the present case, the public representatives can be deemed to have violated the law of the land, through the 'act/omission of a government functionary.'

(e) Was the tribunal correct in expressing the view that the public representatives were required to perform functions other than what they have done in this case.

(f) Whether their conduct in the present case was 'an example of unnecessary interference in the affairs of the government functionaries.'

(g) In the case the observations and findings by the tribunal with regard to the removal of the respondents are upheld whether, the tribunal was competent through the same impugned judgment to restore the order of appointment passed in his favour as it was prima facie tainted with the same infirmities which were noticed in the judgment.

(h) All other related constitutional, legal and jurisdictional questions.

Educated Said Joining Criminal Gangs

92AS0455A Karachi JANG (Supplement) in Urdu
23 Dec 91 p D

[Article by Mohammad Arshad in special section entitled, "Sindh: How Will Law and Order Be Established?"]

[Text] Benazir Bhutto, cochairperson of the Pakistan People's Party, said during her recent tour of Sindh that the people of that province had been left to the mercy of bandits and that their lives were in shambles. As a matter of fact, the issue of law and order in Sindh has challenged every government in office for the last six years. It was expected that after the sense of deprivation was dispelled, the People's Party government would establish law and order in Sindh during its term of office. But the problem of law and order became even more serious during Benazir's term and the activities of bandits reached a new height. Since the new government has come into office, the law- and-order problem in Sindh has improved significantly. Inside Sindh, operations have been mounted against the bandits and according to government figures, large number of bandits have been killed. Moreover, major cities such as Karachi and Hyderabad, which were hit by curfews, are not now experiencing such curfews proving that conditions are better in every way. However, a general survey of the situation in Sindh reveals a worrisome picture. According to a statistical report, bandits receive 500,000 to 1 million rupees in ransom daily and in Sindh's small and large cities almost 150 thefts are committed every day. Because of the law-and-order situation, various industries have moved out of Sindh to other areas; conservatively estimated, 7 billion rupees worth of

industries have left Sindh so far. Bandit activity has seriously affected the transportation and agriculture sectors as well.

Traveling towards the southwest as the Sindh River flows, one arrives at the rural and urban areas of Sukkur, Nawabshah, Jacobabad, Larkana and Davoud where curfew is imposed at twilight. The people are afraid to come out of their houses; bands of young villagers perform sentry duty and on major highways, passenger buses and trucks travel under the protection of semimilitary armed escorts. According to a conservative estimate, 17,000 bandits are holding Sindh hostage. In the past, individuals were abducted; now entire buses are being kidnapped. Theft used to be a crime; now it is an industry, a new industry in which, on an average, 200 individuals are abducted each month and millions of rupees are extracted. A prominent member of Sindh's leading religious and political Makhdum family of Hala, Makhdum Khaliq us Zaman, says that now educated professional young men are joining the ranks of the bandits. In the past, bandits traditionally fled into the forest after committing murder or kidnaping women; their aim was to find sustenance. Nowadays, an individual is abducted and held for a ransom of 5 to 6 million rupees. One can gauge the seriousness of the situation from the astonishingly organized manner in which the bandits work. They have established a system of hiring all unemployed young men who are then paid salaries and given motorcycles. They are moreover guarantee that if they should be killed, their heirs would receive hundreds of thousands of rupees in compensation. The bandits have crippled the legal system in rural areas and have forced the villagers, who are afraid for their lives, to provide them with information, hiding places, and various other things. Some criminal landlords afford patronage to bandits and arrange settlements between the relatives of the abducted individuals and the bandits. Police in Sindh are commonly believed to be on the bandits' payroll. All the operations that have been mounted against the bandits so far have not been very effective because of weak planning and lack of secrecy. It is known that secret negotiations were held with the bandits to free individuals abducted by the bandits, whether these individuals were Chinese, Japanese, or influential Pakistanis.

The question is, can a solution be found for the bandit problem. Some circles believe that a single large-scale military operation should be mounted; others emphasize the need to pay attention to Sindh's economic deprivation. They believe that if young men are able to obtain employment, they are saved from despair; that unemployed youth are the raw material of crime. Some groups believe that nothing can be achieved as long as the present framework of the police and administration remains intact and that these organizations need to undergo revolutionary changes; others believe that the bandits should be granted general amnesty with certain conditions attached. Whatever the causes of the disorder, the question is, when will law and order be

established in Sindh? When will the land full of love, which gave birth to Sachal Sarmast and Shah Latif, be rid of the bandits?

Death Threats Against Journalists Condemned

92AS0405B Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 27 Nov 91 p 3

[Editorial: Threats to Journalists]

[Text] According to a newspaper published in Karachi, telephone callers threatened its senior editorial employees with death and their families with serious harm. Not just one newspaper or a few journalists have encountered such threats because for some time it has become routine, especially in Karachi, for troublemakers to attack newspaper offices directly or to commit violent acts against journalists. Threats over the telephone to kill or burn down homes have become common occurrences. The respectable profession of journalism has fallen hostage to street toughs, political hoodlums, and terrorists. Journalists are aware of the identities of these groups and the elements who threaten and attack them and the people also know well who they are; but faced with the unbridled lawlessness and terrorism of these elements, no one is willing to speak out. Over the past few days, newspapers were threatened in open assembly and were called "saints with sticks," but everyone can see that the courage of these stick bearers, even though forced, is being shown in the newspapers [illegible text] because newspaper owners and journalists are not certain that any government or administration can protect them. However, the demands of the terrorists keep increasing and it seems as though they want to see all of the newspapers publish only the statements, pictures, and accounts of the trivial activities of the terrorists and nothing else. The terrorists can force a newspaper to stop publishing for several days unless it agrees to virtually become their spokesman. On the other hand, the government will only give reassurances at every level and do nothing. At the time when all newspapers in Karachi were totally boycotted and armed terrorists openly stopped press cars on the streets and seized newspapers, if the government had immediately taken strong measures, it would not be in such a helpless situation today. The government's powerlessness has convinced terrorists that they can do as they please in Karachi while the government and its entire administrative machinery look the other way. When a weekly newspaper's office or a journalist's house is burned down, the criminals are allowed to escape. Recently, a few members of a movement were caught after they attacked the office of a Karachi newspaper; but no one could find out what happened subsequent to their arrest.

Past Year Reviewed as 'Year of Scandals, Shame'

92AS0459B Lahore VIEWPOINT in English 2 Jan 92 p 10

[Text] For quite a few years, we have been talking of the collapse of institutions of democratic governance. The

view has been based on a reading of the trends visible over a fairly long period. The year 1991 will be remembered in the history of Pakistan as the year which witnessed the decay of democratic institutions and norms to an extent that the fact cannot be disputed and hopes of redemption are hard to entertain.

Two days before the year ended, a special tribunal comprising a judge of the High Court cleared the Sindh House Adviser of the charge of involvement in a case of gang-rape, dismissed the public outcry over the outrage as politically motivated, and deemed it proper to invent his own version of events. And all this after only hearing a party controlled by the accused. This was no ordinary case of a quasi-judicial process being used to provide Authority with a pretext to avoid compliance with the norms of democratic accountability. It made the head of State subject of a controversy no system of responsible Government can afford and confirmed that the country remains in the grip of an increasingly arbitrary rule.

The President

The President's determination to protect his son-in-law in utter disregard of the demands of his august office crowned a whole series of incidents that invited doubts about his respect for constitutional propriety. On several occasions earlier on, he chose to defend not only the Government but also the party and individuals in power. He not only allowed the anti-defection law to lapse, he actually justified the abuse of authority and legal processes to secure defection from the Opposition legislative parties. Further, on nearly all important issues—such as the Afghanistan conflict, the nuclear option, judicial discipline—decisions seemed to lie with him and not wholly with the Government. The principle of separation of powers, the basic plank of democratic rule, was thus grievously harmed.

The legislature fared no better. Parliament met at regular intervals but legislation remained low on its agenda. The President issued no less than 39 Ordinances during the year. Two of the most significant and highly controversial pieces of legislation—the Shariah Act and the so-called 12th amendment to the constitution—were discussed, altered and trimmed almost wholly in party caucuses. The indecent haste with which the relevant Bills were rushed through the Houses of Parliament could not consolidate the legislature's position as an organ of State equal in independence and authority to the executive.

The norms of parliament's supremacy were also undermined by the passage of the Shariat Bill which stops just a step short of not only turning Pakistan into an anachronistic theocracy but also confirms the transfer of legislative powers from the legislature to courts held captive by clerics nominated by the executive. Throughout the year, the central pillar of democracy, namely, rule and law-making by elected representatives, seemed to be tottering dangerously.

The third requisite of a democratic dispensation, and independent and fair-minded judiciary, also received severe battering. A parallel system of judiciary was developed to wreck the principle of a uniform dispensation and the increasing drift towards enforcement of religious laws made the judiciary party to the brutalisation of society. The case of the two Americans who were sentenced to the amputation of hands and were subsequently acquitted despite confessional statements made a travesty of justice and only opened the way to the award of barbaric punishments by special courts. Today to claim that the judiciary is in a position to play its appointed role in a democracy is to let the fear of contempt interfere with one's objective assessment.

As regards the fourth estate, a series of blows were struck at its independence. Newspapers continued to be punished by withholding official advertisements. Not only that, newspaper offices and individual journalists were subjected to violence by goons hired by persons in authority and by privileged political and social groups and harassed by the administration.

The continued, and in some respects accelerated, degradation of the essential props of democracy strengthened the drift towards anarchy and erosion of the moral basis of the State power. The scandals of finance companies' plunder, favouritism, in the disposal of public sector units, nepotism in appointments and the shame caused by the use of sexual violence for political ends, molestation of women by landlords and policemen, the kidnapping of foreigners for ransom were all lost in the din of name-calling contests between the rulers and the Opposition. While a few items on the national agenda were partly disposed of—like the meeting the Council of Common Interests and the award of the National Finance Commission—all other issues were deferred. The air is still full of charges of electoral rigging, a fair settlement in Afghanistan is still being resisted, the nuclear issue continues to generate unnecessary strains, the country remains without a foreign policy worth the name, nobody knows how the Government intends to meet the burgeoning budget deficit or to find jobs for the teeming multitude of the unemployed, and ethnic divisions have become more dangerous than ever.

1991 could have been a year of democratic restructuring; in fact it turned out to be a year of missed opportunities.

Article Views 'Press-Government Relations'

92AS0459A Lahore VIEWPOINT in English 2 Jan 92
pp 7-8

[Text] The decades-old debate on Government-Press relations has continued over the last year with greater intensity but without any change in tone or style, since the factors responsible for mutual dissatisfaction, frustration, misunderstandings, and the resultant bitterness, have not changed—and in some respects have worsened.

On the one side, most representative Press organisations stand for undiluted freedom. They claim that Pressmen

should be treated with the respect due to all citizens in accordance with the law of the land; and that they should not be subject to special laws or maltreatment by Authority because it does not approve of the manner in which they perform their duties. In fact, over the last few months, the Press has been treated with unusual harshness. Journalists have frequently been arrested without cause, others have been detained surreptitiously, and still others subjected to torture by the police. In addition to such misuse of State authority, the strange new phenomenon that has surfaced is that political parties and factions have taken it upon themselves to "sort out" the Press and Pressmen. Journalists have been beaten up and injured seriously; others have been threatened with worse; and where differences have gone beyond the level of personal vendetta, newspaper offices have been attacked, and the circulation of newspapers and magazines has been obstructed through the blatant use of force.

Government's Attitude

What is even worse, these fascist trends have not been curbed by Government. Even in a city like Karachi, the country's leading newspaper had to suspend publication for three days because of unchecked hooliganism. On the other hand, although Government does not link these bizarre developments with its own disapproval of certain Press tendencies, the connection is not always difficult to see. From time to time, in reply to complaints of harassment, Government spokesmen, including the Prime Minister himself, have made grave allegations, accusing the Press of speculative reporting and slander. It has even been said that some newspapermen are in the pay of certain agencies or parties and, therefore, indulge in deliberate misreporting; but despite requests by Press organisations that the journalists said to be guilty of such great breach of morality should be named, their identities have not been revealed, except when lists of payment made from the Chief Minister's or the Prime Minister's secret funds were published.

The Press is also accused of being irresponsible, and the Prime Minister has, in a recent statement, declared that Pressmen must learn to say goodbye "to dirty politics and dirty politicians." He went so far as to say that Press sensationalism led certain people to believe that Pressmen wanted to break up the country; and he declared that in his view, "the future safety of the country was much more important than Press freedom."

Who Decides?

This declaration begs the question. Who is to decide whether the statement of a politician or the comment made by a newspaper is damaging for the country? Obviously, in the last analysis, only the people can decide. However, if a journalist or a politician is suspected of transgressing the law, both should be subject to prosecution in accordance with due process. What no democrat can possibly tolerate is the Establishment's desire to exercise powers to punish newspapers even

beyond the pale of the law—either through unscrupulous Government functionaries or at the hands of favoured political goons. The fact remains that both can only damage their own case by taking the law into their own hands.

The question of a code of conduct was also raised by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif recently. It is not very clear whether he fully understands the issue, because he is reported to have said that if Pressmen do not voluntarily evolve a code of conduct, the Government would have to impose one. This is a contradiction in basic terms. A Press council enforcing a code of conduct does so on the basis of a voluntary desire on the part of newspapers to maintain certain standards of ethics and prevent newspapers from indulging in libel or a violation of privacy. Where a newspaper violates the law of the land, the Government is at liberty to prosecute it in accordance with the law. Any other course of action can only do violence to the basic principles of Press freedom.

It is suggested, once again, therefore, that Press organizations should try to unite on this point, and the Government should agree to negotiate with them seriously so that the question of Press laws and implementation of a code of conduct can be finalised on the basis of a general consensus, and the country is saved from what the world sees as a Press that is kept under constant threat of being prevented physically from functioning freely.

Truth and Falsehood

Many rulers in many lands are known to be rather miserly with the truth, but very high records seem to have been established in this field in Pakistan over recent decades.

To take an example from the Zia era, which was replete with lies and deceit, how often was it said by the President-CMLA [Chief Martial Law Administrator]—and would be amirul momineen—that Pakistan's soil was not being used as a conduit for Western arms supplies to the Afghan rebels. Yet, as with other historic goebbelsian lies, the arms denied kept coming by sea and land and air, and were stored disastrously in many different places in Pakistan and then funnelled to the Afghan Mujahideen. President Sadat made the first leak in the matter when he confessed that Soviet arms given to Egypt during its treaty relationship with the USSR had been shipped at U.S. request to the Afghan Mujahideen via Pakistan. Later, the Western Press began to lift the veil of secrecy and gradually told the world how the CIA's biggest operations had been mounted from Pakistan's territory, with many of America's friends helping with the arrangements. More recently, it has been revealed that among America's friends, the Israelis had also lent a helping hand to train the Afghan Mujahideen and also oversee the supply of arms to Iran across the Pak-Iran border during Gulf War I as part of the illegal Iran-contra deal.

Local Bodies Polls

The catalogue of IJI [Islamic Democratic Alliance] skulduggery devised by General Zia's heirs is voluminous. The latest happening of this nature is perhaps so minor that it will not be listed in history's footnotes as a big fraud, but it deserves mention because it illustrates the tradition of replacing truth with falsehood that has been kept alive with great care. It has been said again and again by the rulers that local body polls would be held on a non-party basis, because this was said to allow merit to emerge and the people's real problems to be highlighted and given proper attention. The basic thesis devised to justify Government policy rested on the false premise that in most democratic countries local body polls are divorced from politics and political parties. However, the obvious purpose of this stipulation was to disqualify Opposition party candidates should they win an awkward number of seats in any district council or municipality, as was done during the Zia period.

At the same time, all necessary arrangements were made by the ruling party to ensure that this could not happen. The administration was alerted months ago to help official candidates, and from the lambarदार up to the highest bureaucrat all State functionaries have been asked to serve the ruling party. Funds were allocated on a large scale through local councils and legislators, so that IJI nominees could prove to the people immediately that they were in a position to deliver the goods. It was also considered expedient to take the unusual step of

barring Assembly members from taking part in local body elections; presumably, this was meant to create a wider division of the spoils of office among the large number of parties and factions working with or for the IJI.

Partisanship Evident

Apart from the pre-election rigging, the administration's partisanship has been so blatant that it is farcical for the Chief Minister and his patrons to keep talking of non-party elections. In fact, Ghulam Haider Wyne himself could not resist the temptation to declare two weeks ago that a large number of "PML [Pakistan Muslim League] councillors" had been elected unopposed, and that similarly a number of municipal committee seats had been captured by the Pakistan Muslim League and its allies. He further declared that the polls would be a test of the ruling party's popularity. So much for Government's neutrality and non-party elections. Then, the rules laid down by Government for a ban on advertisements and extravagant publicity have been ignored by its nominees, and only its opponents have been harassed on this count.

In the circumstances, the easily predictable results of the local body polls bring no great kudos to the ruling party, but the new system being established should invite careful thinking among all Opposition parties on how they can possibly break through the barriers raised by the Government against genuinely democratic elections.

NTIS
ATTN PROCESS 103

2

5285 PORT ROYAL RD
SPRINGFIELD VA

22161

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, military, economic, environmental, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available sources. It should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed. Except for excluding certain diacritics, FBIS renders personal names and place-names in accordance with the romanization systems approved for U.S. Government publications by the U.S. Board of Geographic Names.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Central Eurasia, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.